

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLV No. 4 APRIL 1960

ENGLISH SPIRITUAL WRITERS

XVI. WILLIAM BERNARD ULLATHORNE, O.S.B.

ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE is remembered today as an energetic pastoral bishop and as a colourful personality. His books, except his *Autobiography*, are all but forgotten, and so is the fact that he was a skilled director of souls. This less well-known side of his character entitles him to take his place among English spiritual writers. For him, activity and prayer were closely woven together; both must be studied if we are to understand the man. We must also know something of the background of his life, at least of the major events of his full and varied career; these were formative influences in his development.

A traditional Catholic and a descendant of St Thomas More, Ullathorne was born in 1806. While a boy he met priests trained at Douai who were among those who escaped from France at the time of the Revolution and founded the Colleges in England. He is a remarkable link with those days, having lived until 1889. In the *Autobiography* he recalls how he "was much entertained by their college stories". He has left a vivid picture of the Sunday devotions of Catholics at the beginning of the nineteenth century:

On the Sundays between the visits of the priests it was arranged that the flock should attend chapel morning and afternoon as usual, and my father and Mr Pexton (who had been a Church student at Ushaw, but had given up the idea of the ministry) were appointed to act as readers on alternate Sundays. First the usual English prayers were read aloud; then all in silence read the prayers for Mass in the *Garden of the Soul*, making a sort of spiritual Communion, and then the lector for the week read one of Archer's sermons. In the afternoon the usual psalms and prayers were said aloud and the children made their catechism to the lectors. None of us youths had made our first Communion; and as to Confirmation, we had none of us

ever seen a Bishop. There were only four in all England and Wales.

There were no early signs of a vocation; on the contrary, he was rather restless and it was at his own wish that he went to sea at the age of sixteen. When his ship called at the port of Memel the strange incident occurred which he always referred to as his youthful conversion. He tells the story himself and fittingly rescues from oblivion the name of the man who, under God, was responsible:

When Sunday morning came in the harbour Mr Craythorne, the mate, said to me "William, let us go to Mass." I fished up my *Garden of the Soul*, from the bottom of my sea chest and we set off. . . .

Mass had begun when we entered the chapel: the moment I entered I was struck by the simple fervour of the scene; it threw me into a cold shiver; my heart was turned inward upon myself; I saw the claims of God upon me, and I felt a deep reproach within my soul.

Sudden conversions of this sort are rare among Catholics, particularly so when the results are as striking and as permanent as they were in this case. The religious experience or grace given to Ullathorne in the wooden chapel at Memel was so profound that he said "I lived in a sort of rapture of the imagination until I reached London," and, in fact, the rest of his long life was wholly dedicated to the service of God. Mr Craythorne was to render another important service; during the voyage home young Ullathorne now wanted to read religious books, and the mate, surprisingly enough, was able to lend him a life of St Francis of Sales and Gobinet's *Instruction of Youth*. This incident, while providing an interesting sidelight on the spirituality of the Catholics of the time, was of considerable importance in Ullathorne's formation, for this introduction to St Francis of Sales and St Jane Frances Chantal was to grow into a lifelong intimacy. Sixty-six years later, referring to this event, he wrote:

That book imprinted on my then fervid mind two ideals, like two immovable seals; the ideal of a Bishop in the image of

St Francis of Sales, and the ideal of a nun in the image of St Jane Frances.¹

We find these ideals reflected both in the way he combined the active and contemplative life and in his friendship with Mother Margaret Hallahane which must rank with the great spiritual friendships.

His career at sea ended abruptly as a result of this "altered state of mind" leaving him with a "sailor's heart" which added zest to the long journeys to and from Australia during which he would look on his cabin as "that floating hermit's cell". He persuaded his father to send him to Downside as a Church student; there he was to spend nine years using his prodigious industry and retentive memory to make up for lost time for he was already seventeen and had left school at twelve; there, too, he read and was fascinated by the writings of St Bernard and the stories and writings of the Fathers of the Desert. Of the latter he says:

They became to me what Robinson Crusoe had been to my childhood—a grand romantic spiritual ideal, to be somehow realized and acted upon.

While he was a novice a crisis developed in the form of a strong attraction towards the Cistercian life; he was advised to make his profession as a Benedictine, and although he never doubted the wisdom of this advice the attraction was no passing whim; one finds here and there in his letters quite wistful references to the life of prayer and recollection which would have been his had he become a Trappist; he once referred to "a vision of things beyond my reach". As it was, the course of theology not being as systematized as it is today, he concentrated on studying the Fathers of the Church, specially the early Fathers, a habit he retained all his life. Preaching at his funeral, Bishop Hedley said:

Those who remember Bishop Ullathorne in his youth recall the figure of a student bowed over the folio of a Father of the Church.

¹ *Letters of Archbishop Ullathorne*, p. 527.

Not only did he read the Fathers extensively, he remembered what he read and must be considered an accomplished patristic scholar. There is scarcely a page in the books he was to write in later life without a quotation from the Fathers and when not quoting he makes their notions his own. At Downside, too, he tells us incidentally, he learnt by heart all the Epistles of St Paul as well as the Sunday Gospels.

He was ordained in 1831 and immediately began to play a leading part in the affairs of the Church and State. One may well think that authority came too soon; it certainly came in circumstances which would have tested the experience of a mature man. The almost fantastic story of his arrival in Australia as Vicar General for the Bishop of Mauritius, whose Vicariate included both Australia and South Africa, is well known. Although he was only twenty-seven and looked far younger, he had to deal with a situation in which the three priests already working there, men of strong personality, were all at loggerheads with each other and with the Government. His versatility and ability were demonstrated at once. Not only did he deal with the ecclesiastical situation, he also campaigned successfully for a reform of the penal laws. They were stormy years in Australia and undoubtedly an important factor in the development of his self-assertive and forceful personality.

Within a few years of his arrival in Australia, as Cuthbert Butler puts it in his *Life and Times of Ullathorne*, "the mitre destined inevitably to descend was already hovering over Dr. Ullathorne's head". He was more than once nominated to Australian sees but each time his *nolo episcopari* was accepted; on returning to England, however, he was persuaded by Cardinal Acton to accept the Western District and was consecrated Bishop and Vicar Apostolic in 1846; six years later he became the first Bishop of Birmingham in the restored hierarchy. Thus he was closely involved in all the controversies and difficulties which beset English Catholicism in that period of transition during the second half of the nineteenth century out of which emerged, from the Church of the Vicars Apostolic, the Church much as we know her today. The really astounding Church expansion, the Oxford Movement, the Oxford Question, the Restoration of the Hierarchy, the Vatican Council were some

of the major matters with which he was concerned. It is not easy for us to realize either the extent of the changes that took place or the difficulties of adjustment. We must remember how limited and isolated the indigenous Catholic body had become both in their lives and in their spirituality. To take just two examples: the rosary was known to only a few, and the religious habit was not worn even in religious houses, indeed it is Ullathorne who is reputed to have been the first to wear the Benedictine habit in a public Church in England. It is necessary to understand these things not only to see Ullathorne in perspective but also to appreciate the characteristics of much that is still to be found in English spirituality. There is a good description of this old tradition in a Lenten Pastoral Ullathorne wrote in 1862 which parallels the moving passages in Newman's sermon *The Second Spring*. Ullathorne knew this Bishop Challoner Catholicism from the inside:

Our fathers in the faith, in the generations gone before, lived in their own quiet circles. Where their duty, business or work did not call them, they held but limited communication with the world at large. A small and scattered remnant, thrown back upon themselves through the prejudices of their neighbours and clinging to their persecuted faith, their religion was all in all to them. They kept, with rare exceptions, to the traditional habits of their fathers, to prayers in the families, to spiritual reading, to the two days of abstinence in the week throughout the year, to the strict laws of fasting upon one meal—and they went with their three days of preparation to confession and Communion on at least the seven festivals of the year, following up each Communion with three days of thanksgiving. Our fathers had not those copious aids at their choice, or those varied attractions presented through the outward administrations of the Church with which we have been blessed. They had neither churches in their canonical form and amplitude, nor the richer ceremonial of the Church, nor religious music—or at least but seldom—to stimulate their piety; nor Benedictions of the Blessed Sacrament, nor change of preachers, nor missionary retreats, nor Sisterhoods or Brotherhoods, nor any other outward means of stimulating them to repentance and devotion; except their quiet low Mass and quiet sermon with their catechism at home and in the chapel. In many places a priest appeared but occasionally, then the

congregation assembled in their little chapel for prayers. Such were the simple ways of those who carried the light of faith before us. The names of the martyrs, now so much forgotten, were household names and like the memories of dear friends. They fed their piety and imbued their spiritual wisdom from plain, clear and solid books, few and select, such as *The Garden of the Soul*, *The Spiritual Combat*, *The Following of the Saints* and some solid book of *Meditations*. Not having the outward luxuries of religion in the way that the Church now displays them to us, they were not fanciful about a choice of confessors, a variety of spiritual exercises and devotions, or about the style and execution of Church music. The good souls among them had a gift of persevering in their methods of prayer, when once adopted.

This was the order of things under the Vicars Apostolic with which Ullathorne really rather sympathized; yet he was not a reactionary as were so many of his contemporaries; not only did he appreciate that there was and must be a new situation, he understood it and throughout all the difficulties of the time his strong personality, balance and breadth of view put him in a class apart. One need only refer to his friendship and sympathy for Newman who once wrote to him "I was not prepared for such extreme kindness and tender consideration". It can be said that he had the confidence of all at a time when many were suspicious of each other. Wiseman suggested that Ullathorne should be his successor at Westminster as "the bridge between the various elements which make up the Catholic body in England", and he was in fact Propaganda's choice, overruled though it was when Pius IX appointed Manning. Both Propaganda and Manning, however, frequently consulted him; Cardinal Barnabò wrote "Your prudence is well known to us" when he sought Ullathorne's help in dealing with the furore created by Manning's use of his Oblates of St Charles. His relations with Manning, although often subject to tension, remained friendly and Ullathorne was able, more than once, to exercise a restraining influence. An instance of this is to be found in his part in Manning's book *The Eternal Priesthood*, the only one of the Cardinal's books still widely read. The draft was sent to Ullathorne for criticism which was freely given, yet Manning wrote "I will follow out all your suggestions for I accept them

fully". The book dealt with one of the many subjects on which Ullathorne felt strongly, and it was to further his high ideals of the priesthood that he founded a seminary, St Bernard's, whose constitutions he drafted himself. This experiment, however, like Manning's seminary at Hammersmith, was not to survive its founder for long.

In the midst of this activity Ullathorne found time for writing and spiritual direction which were, with his seminary, the great consolations of his life. Most of his direction was given to nuns; indeed his encouragement of the religious life among women was a feature of his work for the Church both in Australia and in England. He was indefatigable in writing letters and they must be a chief source in any appreciation of him as a spiritual writer. A selection was published in 1892 in *The Letters of Archbishop Ullathorne*; this book of 550 pages contains a number of letters of direction, but there are hundreds of such letters still unpublished in various convents. It was, too, under his direction that Mother Margaret Hallahan attained quite unusual powers of prayer.

Although publication of the major works on the Christian Life which he planned was long delayed he was continually busy with smaller publications and Gillow is able to list a total of fifty-two titles; if all his occasional writings were included, tracts, sermons, pamphlets and so on, the total would amount to well over seventy. An important treatise appeared in 1855, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*. This was written as a work of popular theology shortly before the definition of the dogma and is one of the most successful and readable of Ullathorne's books, winning high praise from Newman who said of it in *The Letter to Dr. Pusey*:

If anyone wants to see our doctrine drawn out in a treatise of the present day he should have recourse to Dr. Ullathorne's exposition of the Immaculate Conception, a work full of instruction and of the first authority.

In the 216 pages of this book three chapters are specifically devoted to an examination of the teaching of the Fathers and Divines while there are no less than 186 Scriptural quotations, 102 of these being from the Old Testament.

The first of his monumental works, *The Endowments of Man*, did not appear until 1880 when he was seventy-four, to be followed two years later by *The Groundwork of Christian Virtues*, and by *Christian Patience* in 1886. It is no good pretending that these books make easy reading today, although in their time they were widely read and ran to several editions. They have attained the status of "rare books"; the pity is that these great period pieces are sometimes cast away when a library is pruned. The marshalling together of texts from the Fathers alone makes them a magnificent and unique quarry. The style, old world and vigorous, suffers from Ullathorne's habit of rewriting and expanding passages. Bishop Hedley characterizes his books as "solid, large, learned and picturesque", yet, as R. H. Hutton remarked in a contemporary review in *The Spectator*, "they have caught the sweetness of light from the Fathers of the Church".

These books show that Ullathorne was primarily a writer on Ascetics. *The Endowments*, intended as an introduction to *The Groundwork*, contains fourteen long lectures originally given to the students of St Bernard's Seminary, and provides an exhaustive treatment of all that concerns the nature, destiny, supernatural gifts and shortcomings of man. The nature of man, though made in the image of God, is a fallen nature, hence man must discipline himself, train his will, and obtain self-mastery in order to be able to systematically build up the virtues.

The Groundwork of Christian Virtues is the book to which Ullathorne had given so much thought and it is here that he develops his teaching on the virtue of humility which was to have been the original title. He took humility in its fullest and deepest sense to mean the acknowledgement of our utter dependence on God; to grasp this fact is for him the secret of spiritual progress; holiness of life is attained only by man being drawn out of himself and clinging to the supreme excellence of God; the exercise of this virtue secures the perfection of every virtue. The treatment of the Degrees of Humility in this work is an example of Ullathorne's painstaking research and is a dissertation of lasting value.¹ Of this part of the book he said:

¹ *Groundwork*, pp. 374-85.

I have never yet seen them (the Degrees of Humility) explained so as to make their principle intelligible. St Thomas has scarcely done it for want of more explanation. Father Baker tries in one of his MSS., and confesses he gives it up in despair. I think from turning it over so long I may succeed, simply because I can put the other writers together, and see what has been overlooked, in which the early Fathers, whom St Benedict followed, give some light.¹

This is typical Ullathorne; confident and describing so well just what he set out to do: "to put the other writers together". He succeeded and it would be difficult to find a more competent essay on the subject.

It has been said that Ullathorne built his ascetical teaching round the virtue of humility and his mystical teaching round the virtue of patience. When he decided to write *Christian Patience* he was already seventy-seven years old.

What is wanting is to show how essentially interior patience forms a joint groundwork with humility, and is the sure and only way of making the soul solid, truly humble and progressive in all interior good.²

Christian Patience is of special interest because it contains his directions on prayer, clear definite instructions based on the teaching of St Gregory the Great and St Catherine of Siena. He was attracted to St Gregory because he saw in him an early and outstanding example of the union of the active with the contemplative life. Cuthbert Butler in his book *Western Mysticism* says that Ullathorne's *Patience* is the only place in modern literature on mysticism wherein St Gregory's fine passage on contemplation in the Homily of Ezechiel (II, ii) has been used or St Gregory himself recognized as a great master of mystical theology. There is nothing new of course in Ullathorne's teaching, he is the last person from whom one would expect novelty; his emphasis is on essentials, on principle as he would say, on the work of the Holy Spirit and on the will. It is significant that the two chapters on Prayer are preceded by a chapter on the Gifts of the Holy Ghost which serves as an introduction, the

¹ *Letters*, p. 420.

² *Ibid.*, p. 432.

three chapters together forming a little treatise on the subject. The gift which he picks out for emphasis is that of fortitude, the gift which inspires courage to undertake great things; the secret of advance in prayer lies here. On the human level fortitude corresponds with the virtue of patience and in a chapter "Patience in Prayer" he says that patience in prayer is synonymous with progress in prayer. He develops the classical teaching that union with God is not a matter of the emotions but of the intellect through faith and of the will through hope and charity and explains that patience, "surrender to the will of God", is a far deeper virtue than perseverance:

The chief virtues to be exercised in times of dryness, darkness, and interior suffering, are patient faith, patient hope, and patient charity raised to the degree of fortitude. We must endure for the love of God, believe in his loving care of us, wait in patience for the light of His countenance, and persevere in our prayers. A hundred have perseverance for one who has patience; but without patience that perseverance is of a restless, broken, and unpeaceful kind. Devout surrender to the ways of God, is the summit of patience.¹

The following extract which summarizes his teaching on this focal point is a good sample of his style:

What is the patience of a soul in which all goes pleasantly on the path of prayer, and when she has only to exclude what interferes with recollection, compared with that firm and constant patience that adheres to God amidst obscurity and desolation? This strong meat is not given to the babes of spiritual life, but to those who are chosen for great rewards in eternity. This severe diet purifies the affections from what is sensual, feeble, irritable, or selfish in them, and strengthens the virtues with a view to their perfection. The rewards of prayer are given to its humility, its patience, its charity and purity. Let no one mistake present consolation for the great reward. The first is a grace given to the soul to encourage her to labour for the eternal reward. When prayer is pure it looks more to God and less to present enjoyment. When prayer is patient it abides more steadfastly with God, waits upon His will, and is less attentive to one's inward pertur-

¹ *Patience*, p. 220.

bations. This dry prayer is generous, and most peaceful when most patient. The great final reward, to which all prayer should be directed, is God Himself.

If it please God that the soul should have her winter as well as her summer season, this is a divine policy and a spiritual providence. For just as the providence of God sends the bracing cold, the rainy clouds, and cleansing winds to prepare the earth, that its fruits may gush forth in the summer; so are these trials ordained to brace the soul, to purify the heart, and eradicate the weeds of self-love; to make the spirit strong in fortitude and patience, and to change our soft habits into a more vigorous constitution of life. Hence in the language of theology these trials are called purgations; either purgations of sense, or purgations of the intellect, or purgations of the will.¹

He had little to say of manuals and methods of meditation, although they were popular enough at the time, except that they are useful for those who are still novices in prayer, for those "who have not yet mortified the restlessness of their interior faculties into tranquillity; who have not yet gained much control over their imagination". He does suggest that everyone should learn a good method of meditation, but he warns that as "The Holy Spirit is the mover of prayer, to tie the soul always to that method in all its rules would not only injure freedom, but cause the soul to lose the touch and attraction of the Holy Spirit. Those who look more to rules than to the spirit of prayer will never make progress."

The imagination, the memory, the understanding, that is to say the faculties used in meditation, are just an ascent of the mind by an act of the will to contemplation. He speaks of an interior sense which is in communication with the corporal senses and with the spiritual gifts of God. This spiritual sense "is most intimately connected with the will which must bend down our whole being to the Divine influence".

Vocal prayer should be mental as well as vocal, and spiritual as well as mental. True vocal prayer, he says, is but the outward language of internal adoration:

Pure mental prayer uses no external words, but only internal

¹ Ibid., p. 218.

words. The more the soul is habituated to this interior prayer, the more perfectly she will make her vocal prayer.¹

If his books make rather wearisome reading his letters of direction are written in a freer, less stilted, more spontaneous style and show Ullathorne at the work at which he excelled and give us, too, an insight into his own spirituality, a matter on which he was most reticent as becomes a Catholic of his tradition. Anyone who is familiar with the classic books on prayer will recognize at once in Ullathorne's letters the authentic voice and touch. Well aware of the fact that there are many so-called schools of spirituality he would always take into account the spirit and constitutions of the order to which a religious belonged.

Nevertheless in this matter of direction he would brook no exclusivism. "Beware of the man of one book" he quoted as an axiom of spiritual direction. He once wrote à propos of a superioress "I cordially hate all spiritual tyranny, and, except where the laws of the Church are concerned, I wish to leave all persons at liberty." With no time for sentiment or emotion, or for any form of extravagance in devotion or theology, basing himself always on principle and doctrine, his teaching was exacting, practical and down to earth. All aspects of the spiritual life are covered in his letters; there is advice on mortification, on obedience, letters to superiors, to novices. It is a temptation to quote many of his pungent comments, but all that can be done here is to take one or two examples of his advice on prayer. Time and time again he insists that prayer is primarily a matter of the will, for instance he writes to a nun:

This desire to love God and to adhere to Him alone is the love of God, though without any clear sense that this is so . . . the will is the whole man, and draws after it every other faculty and power, however reluctant to follow.²

Again, to a contemplative nun:

The darkness which, like the black curtain of your choir

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

² *Letters*, p. 284.

hangs before you, is in your sensible nature, which is so far arrested by it, just as the eyesight is arrested and denied by that curtain from penetrating with clearness into the sanctuary. But the sanctuary is there, and you have obscure glimpses of its presence. And so is God with you. Hold by faith and by the will, not by sense or sight. Long and faithful adherence to this state of crucified sensibilities is what our Lord often exacts before he gives clearness to the spiritual sense and the tide of consolation. And blind adhesion to him is a safe state to persevere in. . . .¹

He frequently recommends aspirative prayer not so much as a safeguard against passivity but because it is in the primitive tradition of the Fathers of the Desert. One is reminded here of Fr Baker's teaching with which Ullathorne was familiar. The value of this form of prayer is emphasized in a letter to a nun suffering interior trials:

Remember that God is not to be comprehended by the mind but only by the will. God is present in a divine cloud, which is more dense in those hours of anguish and fear for a greater purgation of the will. In those hours of trial when the soul is without rest and moves here and there, into the past and into the future, your will must not be passive in its exercise, but more active. With a word of aspiration continually repeated you must beat against the divine cloud peacefully, tranquilly.²

There is an interesting paper containing his reminiscences of Mother Margaret Hallahane which shows how she corresponded with these ideals. Of her prayer he wrote:

Aspirative prayer was like the pulsation and rhythm of her spirit, and its subjects were of the most simple and spontaneous character. That "brief and pure prayer", which Cassian tells us was the constant exercise of the early ascetics of the desert, was Mother Margaret's exercise at all times. She had such a power of praying thus internally whilst engaged in external converse, that, if she had a long-winded talker to deal with, she would say the Little Office of the Immaculate Conception during the period without the person being at all conscious of her doing

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

² *Ibid.*, p. 287.

anything except to cordially converse. Once in writing, Mother Margaret let fall the following sentence from her pen, which she ever afterwards regretted, as it was one of her dearest wishes to keep her inward gift a secret from all the world. The words she wrote were these: "Aspirative prayer is to me almost as natural as to breathe, and God is ever soliciting me to closer union with him."¹

He died in 1889, aged eighty-three, in the tradition of the Vicars Apostolic even to his longevity. The ideal of a bishop in the image of St Francis of Sales and the ideal of a nun in the image of St Jane Frances never deserted him. Something of a romantic and an adventurer he found romance and adventure in the service of the Church and the quest for holiness; in the Desert Fathers and Mount Carmel instead of in Robinson Crusoe and at sea. After Challoner, the greatest of the Vicars Apostolic, he played a most enlightened part in welding together the new people whom Challoner foresaw. He was deeply conscious that during his life a new era had started but he was aware also of the continuity of Catholicism in England. Never failing to make the apt and authoritative comment appropriate to any situation he remarked on his death bed "The last of the Vicars Apostolic is passing".

J. C. LAMB

HOPE

ST PAUL says that the entire message of the Scriptures can be summed up in these words: "What things soever were written, were written . . . that . . . we might have hope." This is a striking way of bringing home to us how important a part hope must play in the life of the Christian. The Holy Spirit who inspired the sacred writers to bring this message to us is the same Spirit whose special care it is that we should grow in holiness. If He has assembled and guided a team of authors for the sole purpose of encouraging us to hope, then it is obvious that hope is more than a pleasing ornament of the soul. Hope must be

¹ *Life of Mother Margaret Hallahan*, F. R. Drane, O.P., p. 395.

a vital element in our spiritual life: "everyone that hath this hope in Him sanctifieth himself, as He also is holy".

Exactly why hope should be such a powerful factor in developing the Christian character may not be at once so clear to us, perhaps because we are influenced by the various and even contradictory uses of the word in common speech. The admirable definition of hope minted by theologians from the Scriptures has lost its sharp outline, like a coin that has been long in circulation. We say, "There is nothing we can do; we can only hope," as if hope meant being resigned to the worst. Even when we use the word in the more positive sense of "expectancy", it is still not quite evident what moral value it implies. When we say a friend hopes to receive a present from us, no doubt some compliment to our generosity is suggested, but that is not the point. The question is: is our friend a better person from the mere fact that he hopes?

The answer, of course, is that hope in the Scriptural sense has a much fuller and richer meaning. If we want to know just how hope wins and keeps for us the friendship of God we must analyse what goes on in the mind of those who hope. We shall find that hope is a complex act or frame of mind which calls for the constant use of will power, helped, of course, by Almighty God. It is because it is the offspring of grace and free will that hope is an integral part of our growth in holiness.

1. *Hope is an act of love.*

When we hope, we are not assenting to the abstract proposition that "God will give us eternal life and all the means necessary to obtain it, if we do what He requires of us". To assent to that proposition is the business of the intellect, enlightened by faith. Hope is a different kind of activity altogether. It is only when that assent has been given that there is room for the further state of mind we call hope. Basically, hope is a form of desire, and as such it is an act of the will. When it first rises in our soul, this desire is automatic and spontaneous, since we cannot but want what the intellect portrays as attractive. It is only when we advert to this desire of eternal life as set before us by faith, and proceed to approve and cherish it, that our desire becomes part of our moral and spiritual life. Faith has provided the raw

material, the substance out of which our act of hope is made, but that act itself is a deliberate choice by which we give full rein to our pursuit of God.

Hope, then, is the echo in the heart, of the voice of faith in the intellect. It is an act of love, for it is an impulse, consciously encouraged, to see God and enjoy His company. It is of the hopeful man the psalmist is speaking when he puts into his mouth the words: "my soul longeth and fainteth for the courts of the Lord". True, the act of love involved in hope is not so perfect, not so disinterested, as the love we call charity, but it is love nevertheless, and for that reason it has that power which love always has, to shape our life and conduct. All those things which a lover is ready to do and to suffer in order to possess the object of his affections, are gladly endured by those who truly hope. It was after he had described the grounds of Christian hope that St Paul broke out into that noble burst of eloquence: "What then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation? or distress? . . ."

2. *Hope involves a dedication of self to the service of God.*

Hope is a desire, but a special kind of desire. By hope we not only want everlasting life, we are confident we shall get it. It is, in fact, this unshakable confidence despite all difficulties, a confidence which accompanies and sharpens our desire, which gives to hope one of its outstanding characteristics. But that assurance demands on our part a deliberate surrender of ourselves to the service of God.

We have simply no Scriptural warrant whatsoever for hope unless, until, and so long as we are resolved to do God's will: "He is not crowned who does not strive lawfully." Any confidence we may profess, if not joined to a present determination to co-operate with Almighty God, is not the virtuous mentality of hope, but the vicious attitude of presumption. Faith does not put eternal life before us as a straight offer, but in the form of a contract. It is a contract to which Almighty God has already put His signature, and to which the believer is invited to put his own. Only in so far as he is prepared to do so has he any right to hope. What, after all, is the difference between those who hope and those who presume? Both believe in everlasting life,

both want it, both are confident they shall have it. But they differ in one important respect. Those we call hopeful see their salvation as a joint enterprise between God and themselves and are ready to do their part; the presumptuous, if indeed there can be such people, see no need to co-operate.

Those who hope, then, are committed to a life lived according to God's law. Once again it is the hopeful man who says in the psalm: "Give me understanding and I will study Thy law, and I will keep it with my whole heart."

3. *By hope we cleave directly to God, and are thus in immediate contact with the source of all perfection.*

When we hope, the immediate target of our aspiration is not precisely the future vision of God, but God here and now winning our confidence. The assurance of enjoying God in heaven is consequent upon, almost a by-product of, our resolve to take God's promises at their face value.

The truth of this is clearer if we compare our attitude when we hope with our attitude when we believe, because our mental process is the same in both cases. When we believe, our act of faith is centred upon God whose authority we accept. It would be possible to make a perfect act of faith without knowing the creed. Strictly speaking, we do not believe in doctrines; we believe in Jesus Christ, and we accept the doctrines which Jesus Christ happens to teach. Similarly, when we hope, we first trust our Lord because He is faithful, and, as a result, we are confident of eternal life, because that happens to be what He is promising. We make our act of hope, without, as it were, stopping to enquire what exactly it is we hope to get. Our act of hope is centred upon God promising and not the thing promised.

This is not an idle subtlety, but is in fact the key to the sanctifying power of hope. Hope is a life line connecting us directly with God who is the source of spiritual life and energy. By hope our spiritual life has its centre in Him who alone can give point and purpose and direction to our efforts.

To see how true this is we need only contrast those who hope with those who despair. Sacred Scripture warns us that eternal life is only to be had as the result of a struggle. When

confronted with this challenge, some contract out of the fight, either because they think the loss of present pleasure too high a price to pay, or because, aware of their own frailty, they decide "the struggle nought availeth". They are guilty of despair. Others, equally aware of their own defects, look fixedly at God's mercy and say "I am needy and poor; do Thou, O Lord, help me." Confident that "I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me", they fight manfully on. That is the mentality of Christian hope.

Now we may be inclined to sympathize with those who despair, at least with those of them who are oppressed by the thought of their sins. They do seem to have humility at any rate. But is this really the case? Is it not truer to say that all who despair are too much occupied with self? Those who prefer the pleasure of the moment clearly are; those who are obsessed by their sins equally so. They are so hypnotized by their own little world that they cannot see the outstretched arms of God. It is a form of conceit to exaggerate one's sins until they become more important than the mercy of God which is "above all His works".

Those who hope, on the other hand, have their gaze fixed, not downward and inward on self, but outward and upward to God. It is because, by a resolute act of will, they refuse to take their eye off God, that they are drawn to Him as if fascinated by His loving appeal. Their life has its centre of gravity in Him and for that reason they are spiritually poised and balanced.

4. *Hope is the necessary bridge between faith and charity.*

Revealed truths are not made known to us for their academic interest and novelty. Faith is not a speculative science but the key to a practical plan of life. Faith has not achieved its purpose until we observe God's law by charity. By faith we learn what to do; by charity we do it. But between knowledge and performance, theory and practice, there is an important stage in which we make the decision to act upon our knowledge. So important, indeed, is this step that without it we shall, in fact, do nothing at all. Without the decision to act, the truths of faith remain just so many items of information. The first step towards living the faith is to decide to do so; and hope is the

stage
The c
hope
keep
F
in the
affair
opt f
whic
impu
spirit
5. W
Char
cent
hope
unle
we c
the s
anot
our
will
agre
How
may
pers
a li
to u
intr
spa
it i
bea
so.
foc
pre
cor
ap

stage of our spiritual development at which that step is taken. The dedication of ourselves to the keeping of God's law, which hope implies and includes, is the necessary step to the actual keeping of God's law which charity requires.

Faith, hope and charity, in other words, are the counterpart in the spiritual life of judging, choosing and acting in everyday affairs. By faith we assimilate the facts of the case, by hope we opt for God's plan, by charity we carry it out. The decision which the hopeful make is an exercise of will power under the impulse of grace. It is therefore a valid contribution to our spiritual growth.

5. *Without hope, charity is impossible.*

Charity means loving God because He is goodness itself; hope centres round God because He is good to us. When we say that hope is a necessary step on the road to charity we mean that unless we make contact with God because of His bounty to us, we do not make contact with Him at all; He remains outside the sphere of our affectionate activities altogether. This is simply another way of saying that hope and charity, being rooted in our will, must follow the normal working of our will. Now our will cannot function except when stimulated by something agreeable to us. It is there to register our personal satisfaction. However excellent a thing may be in itself, however much it may be esteemed by others, it remains outside the range of our personal appreciation until we ourselves find it attractive. Once a link is established between the will and an object congenial to us, we can then, but only then, value the object for its own intrinsic worth.

We may illustrate the point by supposing a star far out in space and brighter than any we know. Until our telescope holds it in focus for us we cannot register any kind of reaction to its beauty and grandeur, but once it is in focus we are able to do so. Now hope, if we may so express it, holds Almighty God in focus for us. It is our reaction to Him as our benefactor. It presents Him to us in the only light in which our will is able to contact any object; we are then in a position to see and appreciate how good He is in Himself.

Hence, St Paul, while putting charity as the coping stone

of the Christian character, says nevertheless, "We are saved by hope."

6. *The lively expectation of heaven is a constant inducement to make ourselves worthy to live in the house of God.*

When St John says "everyone that hath this hope in Him sanctifieth himself as He also is holy", he is not making the simple point that if we want to enjoy the vision of God we must earn it. He is referring rather to the psychological effect of hope on those who have it. First, he says that when we see God face to face in heaven, we shall be so transformed that "we shall be like Him". Then, he adds that even in this life the process of transformation begins for those who have hope. He means that, because "holiness becometh Thy house, O Lord", we who are confident that we shall live there are under a constant urge to fit ourselves for our future destiny. To those who hope, heaven is such a vivid and ever present reality, that the splendour of our surroundings brings home to us our own unworthiness. Imagining ourselves already there, we see our defects in stark contrast to the immense holiness of God and are thus impelled to walk worthy of the vocation in which we are called. Hope is the spur.

St Paul seems to be making the same point in the Epistle which we read at midnight Mass. He is not precisely telling us to be sober, just and godly in order to deserve a welcome from our Lord when He comes again. He takes for granted that we shall meet and enjoy our Lord at His coming. It is this confident expectation itself which should make us begin now to conform our life with that of the Lord we shall meet. For that reason we should forswear worldly desires and so be fit to greet our Lord.

Such, in fact, is the continuity between the state of glory in which we shall see God in heaven, and the state of grace by which we are His friends on earth, that it is psychologically impossible to want the one without wanting the other. Glory is the final flowering of grace, and the vision of God is the final flowering of holiness, so that our one act of hope embraces them all. Those who genuinely hope cannot be indifferent to the cult of holiness. Hence Isaias can say of those who hope for heaven

that, here on earth, "they shall take wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint".

7. *In the battle of life, hope is to the Christian what morale is to the soldier.*

Writers on military matters lay great stress on the importance of morale to the fighting man. "Blood and sweat and toil and tears" are only tolerable if we can look up and see "the land is bright". Sacrifices can be cheerfully made if there is assurance of victory in the end.

What military men teach is of interest to us also because Sacred Scripture constantly refers to man's life on earth as a warfare. In that fight we have the best of leaders in Jesus Christ, the best of weapons in prayer, the best of supply services in the sacraments. But when God and His Church have done their best for us it is for each one to decide whether to be a hero or to be battle-shy, whether to fight or run away. It was to sustain our fighting spirit that the Scriptures were written. The poets, preachers and historians of the Old Testament and the New have unfolded their story to console us with many examples of patient endurance for God and His cause, and to convince us that "the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to come".

When a soldier loses his fighting spirit he malingers or he deserts; when the Christian loses it, he despairs. Speaking of this, a priest of long experience once said that despair was a far more widespread sin than one might have supposed. In saying this he was not thinking of those Catholics who continue with their religious duties although they have tacitly given up any hope of spiritual progress, being convinced, with the pagan poet, that even if nature is pitchforked out she will creep back. Nor was he thinking of the dejected army of the scrupulous, whom no argument can convince that their Commander-in-Chief is a gentleman and not a snooper. No, he was thinking of those who lapse from the Church. It was his theory that the lapsed do not as a rule say "I no longer believe all that", but "I can't live up to it". They feel that religion, with its exacting claims in the moral order, "is not for the likes of me". It certainly seems true to say that leakage generally begins just when

the phoney war of childhood ends and the blitz of adolescence begins.

If this be so it might be well if our children were taught before the crises of the battle begins and while faith is still strong in them, what is the inner meaning of the Scriptural message. St Paul steadied those under persecution by recalling to their minds how faithful God is to His promises. It is by dwelling on this truth that hope is exercised and developed in us. We must remember that the ability to hope was given us at Baptism, but not the facility in hoping. That must come by meditation on the grounds of hope. Hope when quickened in our young people will be to them an "anchor of the soul sure and firm" as it was to the catacomb Christians in their hour of trial. It will encourage them to learn how King David, conscious though he was of his shameful behaviour, could say and repeat in a hundred different ways "Thou art my security and my refuge; my God, in Him will I hope." It will encourage them to be reminded of St Paul's own black record, in spite of which he could sing the praises of Christian hope and then burst into that stirring expression of the fighting spirit: "I am sure that neither death, nor life, or angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

MATTHEW McNARNEY

DIVINE PROVIDENCE AND GERMANY'S TRAGEDY

"WE must never forget that many of them have suffered so terribly that their whole personality has been warped by it." This is the gist of a warning given to missionaries who, from May till October every year, hold six-day missions in the towns and villages of Germany which are predominantly Protestant and are without priest or Catholic church of their own. The people referred to are the millions of refugees who, in 1945-6, were driven out of their homes in what is now Polish

territory. Many of them, besides suffering destitution, hunger and physical exhaustion, were badly beaten up. The Protestant areas of Germany which contain a Catholic minority are known as the Diaspora.

Recently I assisted first a Dutch Capuchin and later a Belgian Jesuit on Diaspora Missions in the Fulda Diocese and I was afraid at first of meeting these people whose sufferings I only knew from books. My fears were dispelled on the first day by the warm and generous welcome which the Diaspora Catholics gave us and it was only later, on visiting their homes, that we met some of those who were still benumbed and bewildered by all they had endured. "What is the sense in all that suffering, Father? If there were a God He could never permit innocent people to be so cruelly treated."

What is the sense in all that suffering? No man can give a complete answer, for suffering is, and will always remain, a mystery, but there are remarkable indications of God's Providence at work in Germany's tragedy and Joseph's words at the end of the book of Genesis can be applied to the Catholic Church in Germany today. "You thought to do me harm, but God turned it all to good account; I was to be raised up in greatness, as you see, for the saving of a multitude of people" (Gen. 1, 20).

From the beginning of the seventeenth century, local German princes had the right to insist that their subjects should either adopt the religion of their leader or move elsewhere. Germany was thus divided into clearly defined Catholic and Protestant groups, the Protestant groups differing among themselves according to the brand of Protestantism favoured by the local prince. Violent controversies raged at first between Catholic and Protestant theologians with many unjust accusations and insults hurled by each side against the other, but in time the real theological differences tended to be forgotten by the majority and only the inherited hostility remained. Ill-feeling, once established, thrives among people who live in close proximity and are content to know only the worst of one another.

The Napoleonic wars, and more especially the rise of industrialism, brought a small minority of Catholics into the Protestant areas, but they remained a minority and tended to lead a

ghetto existence, encouraging and helping one another, but exercising little influence on the non-Catholics around them. There were always men on either side who deplored the division and who worked for a better understanding between Christians, but they could do little against the traditional and deep-rooted suspicion, fear and dislike of the Catholic Church on the Protestant side, and against the general Catholic refusal to attempt a serious and positive appreciation of Luther and the Reformers. Luther was a spoiled priest and a heretic, and there the matter ended.

The rise of Nazism, the war, the collapse of Germany in 1945 and her present divided and precarious state have very largely changed this attitude of mutual Catholic-Protestant fear and suspicion. It still exists, as I shall point out later, but it is rapidly becoming outdated and being replaced by a much more charitable and sympathetic attitude to one another and a mutual recognition of the need which each side has of the other.

Between the two world wars the *Una Sancta* movement, of Benedictine origin, was begun in Germany. Its primary purpose is to encourage all Christians to pray and do penance for the reunion of Christians, but it also attempts to remove misunderstanding between Catholics and Protestants and encourages both sides to learn more about one another, to help and love one another. Even before the war there were two houses at Meitingen and Niederaltaich, which served as discussion centres for Catholic and Protestant theologians. The *Una Sancta* is not an organization, but rather a movement, which depends wholly on the initiative of individual Catholics and Protestants, who realize the ideal by meeting occasionally and discussing their problems and differences. It might have remained one of many isolated attempts at better mutual understanding, kept alive for a time by the efforts of a few enthusiasts and disappearing with their death, but the Nazi regime constituted a threat for both Catholic and Protestant Churches and consciences, and sincere men of different Creeds found a common bond in their opposition to it. This was further strengthened by the war itself. Protestants allowed Catholics to use their churches for Mass when the Catholic church had been bombed and Protestants were allowed to use Catholic churches for their services, and the

homeless, destitute and starving were assisted irrespective of creed. Many non-Catholics came to admire the unity, authority and clear teaching of the Catholic Church and the richness of her liturgy, and were increasingly perturbed at the contradictions and lack of authority in their own Church. In Britain, too, there was a somewhat similar reaction during the war, but the reaction in Germany has been sustained and strengthened by two events, first, the movement of refugees from Silesia, now Polish territory, into Germany, and secondly, the division of Germany and the continual threat of Communism.

In 1945-6 about 6,000,000 Germans were driven from their homes into the present boundaries of Germany. Of these 4,000,000 were Catholic and they settled mostly, and apparently quite fortuitously, in the Protestant areas of Germany, while the 2,000,000 Protestants settled in the Catholic areas. Protestant towns and villages welcomed their destitute Catholic fellow-countrymen, helped to feed, clothe and support them and allowed them the use of Protestant churches for Mass. Since the war, although well over 1000 new Catholic churches have been built in these Protestant areas, 5000 Protestant churches were still being used, until quite recently, for Catholic services. One consequence of this mixing of populations is that Catholics and Protestants have come to know far more about one another and to respect one another, so that many of the old prejudices have vanished. Non-Catholics, too, have learned something of Catholic liturgy and are often enormously impressed, finding in Catholicism much for which they long and which their own Churches deny them. Many Protestants who had not put a foot in their own church for years, not to be outdone by their Catholic neighbours, have started attending their own services and contribute to the repair of their own churches, which had been neglected for years. Of course, there are grave dangers for Catholics in the Diaspora and the number of mixed marriages outside the Church has risen alarmingly. The first village in which we held a Mission had a total Catholic population of 390 and of these 33 had contracted Protestant marriages. There is also the danger that badly instructed Catholics, touched by the kindness and generosity of their Protestant neighbours, reach the muddle-headed conclusion that difference in belief

is of no great moment, provided a man is kind to his neighbour and believes in God. These dangers are inevitable where populations are mixed, especially where Catholics are without a priest or church of their own, but new parishes are being founded and Catholics becoming more and more conscious of their own mission and responsibility in the Diaspora.

If peace reigned in Europe and Germany were united and prosperous, then no doubt Catholics would eventually have settled down with their Protestant neighbours, and though regretting, perhaps, the differences in belief, would have come to accept them as an inevitable evil, like bad weather. But the division of Germany prevents any such complacency. West Germany is free and very prosperous, but also uncertain and fearful that Communism, which already holds the East Zone, may soon sweep westward. The West may hold out the promise of freedom and prosperity, but Communists are not impressed. Freedom, they answer, merely means freedom to exploit, and as for prosperity, the Communist countries are already catching up on the West. Men who are not convinced that man is something sacred, made in the image of God and called to an eternity with God, will offer very little resistance to Communism. The advance of Communism can be delayed, but cannot ultimately be halted, merely by atom bombs. There are many people in West Germany today who, though not Communist, are nevertheless calculating on its eventual triumph and taking care not to show themselves too obviously anti-Communist. Sincere Christians are aware of the danger and they realize the tragedy of their own disunity. Christianity alone can provide an answer to Communism, but Christians are divided and estranged from one another, and men cease believing because they are scandalized by the disunity and apparent helplessness of Christian men and Christian leaders and fail to recognize God's *Signum inter Nationes*. Hence the longing for reunion of Churches is stronger in Germany than in other countries. I omit here any account of the reunion movements going on among the Protestant Churches themselves and give merely a brief outline and a few examples of Catholic-Protestant relations.

German Catholic and Protestant authors no longer snipe at one another as much as in former years, when each was con-

vinced of his own righteousness and of the other's obstinate stupidity. Catholics are coming to recognize and admit, more and more, their own share of blame for the tragedy of the Reformation. One example: the Catholic Church-historian Lortz writes: "Catholics are especially to blame for their failure to take the religious strivings of the Protestant reformers seriously, particularly at the beginning. To this extent all Christians are to blame for the disunity and they must all, therefore, atone for it." The Protestant Church-historian W. Nigg says: "Luther was guilty of grave errors which make it impossible for anyone to give unconditional assent to his teaching," and the historian, Meissinger, certainly a supporter of Luther, speaks of "the diabolic aspect of Luther's character". These quotations are merely examples of the present attitude of fairness and objectivity in historical and theological controversy and of the readiness to admit error and give opponents a fair hearing.

In 1945 the *Una Sancta* brought out its first number of *Una Sancta*, a quarterly for the discussion of controversial questions between Catholics and Protestants. Its motto is *Auch gegen alle Hoffnungen hoffen lehrt uns unser Glaube* (Our Faith teaches us to hope even against hope). Catholics and non-Catholics contribute articles. The *Una Sancta* also organizes occasional public discussions between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians. I attended several of these in the University of Frankfurt. On one evening Confession was discussed. There is a movement to reintroduce private confession into the Protestant Church and indeed some pastors have already introduced it. Another evening was given to "The Priesthood of the Laity and the particular Priesthood". The Protestant speaker on this occasion insisted on the need for properly and legitimately ordained priests in the Protestant Church. A third subject discussed was the relation between Scripture and Tradition. The Protestant speaker emphasized that Scripture can only be understood within the true tradition of the Church and spoke of the need for an authoritative teaching body in the Church. The lecture hall was always filled and the discussion relayed into the room next door which took the overflow. The audiences, sometimes about 800, include professional theologians, working men, housewives and a remarkably high proportion of young people. The atmosphere was

always friendly though differences were honestly expressed and the interest was intense. I always had the impression that the Protestant speaker was trying to show his audience that his sometimes very Catholic views were not a betrayal, but rather a return to the original and largely forgotten Luther.

The Benedictine monastery of Niederaltaich is a centre for Catholic-Protestant meetings. In August 1959 there was a three-day meeting to discuss the relation between Scripture and Tradition. In 1958 at the same time the Eucharist was the theme.

Within the Protestant Church itself there is a movement known as the *Sammlung* (Gathering), under the leadership of the well-known Protestant churchman, Hans Asmussen. In 1954 the *Sammlung* began sending out a series of letters to Protestant ministers and prominent laymen, the seventh and last of the letters running to 20,000 copies and presenting twelve theses for Protestant consideration. If Protestants would be true to Scripture, the letters urged, then they must accept the full implications of the Incarnation, realize that the Church is the Body of Christ, the extension of Christ, that God's grace comes to us through the visible Church which He founded and as He founded it. Hence the need for authority in the Church, for properly and legitimately ordained priests and bishops and for the re-presentation of Christ's unique sacrifice in the Church, etc. The *Sammlung* now continues its work through books and lectures. Unfortunately, the movement seems to have moved rather too quickly Romewards and is therefore losing influence among Protestants, who criticize it as being a betrayal of Reformation principles. Two of the leading members of the *Sammlung* have been expelled from the Union of Protestant Churches (Evangelische Kirche Deutschlands) and have been deprived of their parish and lost the right to preach because they have recognized the Primacy of the Pope. Other leading Protestant theologians deny the reality of Christ's Resurrection but they are not so severely censured. Prejudice still remains.

It is impossible to assess the influence which the *Sammlung* has had and is having. It has raised important and awkward questions for German Protestants and Church authorities. Episcopal Synods and theologians are now taking account of

Catholic dogma and claims, though previously, for religious and political reasons, these questions were never seriously considered.

The German Catholic Bishops have appointed His Grace Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger of Paderborn to be the official representative of the German Hierarchy on Catholic-Protestant relations. Four years ago Archbishop Jaeger founded the Moehler Institute in Paderborn, a Catholic centre for the study of Protestant theology and oecumenical questions. The Director of the Institute is Dr A. Brandenburg, who, as a priest, and while living in the East Zone, studied Protestant Theology for three years. The Institute has an excellent and growing library of Protestant theology and produces a quarterly, *Catholica*, which, like *Una Sancta*, deals with questions of controversy between Catholics and non-Catholics. The Institute also serves as a centre for Catholic-Protestant meetings, e.g. every autumn fifteen Catholic and fifteen Protestant theologians meet together for five days' discussion. Every year Catholics, who are prominent in reunion work, meet together and prepare a report which is submitted to the annual meeting of German Bishops at Fulda.

This is an inadequate sketch of what is being done to promote a better understanding between Catholics and Protestants. However, the importance of the work is not to be found in this or that movement or centre, but rather in the new atmosphere of mutual understanding, and above all of charity, and the consequent gradual removal of the deep-rooted prejudice on either side.

It is this new mood which accounts for the tremendous excitement in the German Press when Pope John XXIII announced the coming Council and there followed a period of wild speculation about reunion with Rome before the century was out. In June of last year, in the famous Benedictine Monastery of Maria Laach, 150 *Publizisten*, including foreign press agencies and journalists, met together for three days and heard and took part in a discussion between Catholic and Protestant theologians on "The coming Council and Christian Unity". There were two introductory papers, the first by His Grace Archbishop Jaeger of Paderborn, the second by Dr J. Beckmann, President of the Rhineland Protestant Church. Dr Stakemeier

of Paderborn read the main Catholic paper, his theme being "The coming Council and the unity of Christians", and Dr Meinhold of Kiel gave the Protestant paper—"Reflections of a Protestant Theologian on the coming Council". The meeting was characterized by the free and honest exposition of Catholic-Protestant differences and clearly showed that any thoughts of immediate reunion are thoroughly utopian. This disappointed the more wildly enthusiastic; but conciliatory speeches and professions of good will, which slide over the real differences, serve no good purpose. Dr Stakemeier gave a clear exposition of the meaning of an oecumenical Council and showed its essential difference from oecumenical movements outside the Catholic Church. He said that the hopes of reunion with the Orthodox Church are slight, and with the Protestant Church slighter still, but that Catholics and Protestants must co-operate whenever, and wherever, they can and strive to overcome their traditional antipathy and prejudice. They must also continue honest discussion of their differences. Dr Meinhold spoke of the need for clarification of the notion of the Church and for an elaboration within the Protestant Church of the implications of the Incarnation, and of the essential visibility of the Church with its concrete traditions, dogma and liturgy. One Catholic theologian, who was present, told me that it was interesting to note the number of non-Catholics present who came round to Dr Meinhold's view. The significance of this speech can hardly be exaggerated, for if any one notion can be singled out as the great divide between Catholics and Protestants, it is this differing notion on the nature of the Church. The oecumenical movement is tackling precisely this problem and more and more Protestants are coming to accept the idea of an essentially visible Church, recognizable in its organized unity. In Germany, however, the majority of non-Catholic theologians still tend to consider the visibility of the Church as an accidental manifestation of the working of the word of God in Scripture upon the minds and hearts of men. Until there is agreement on this fundamental question, inter-confessional meetings cannot hope to get very far. Dr Meinhold's speech was a big step in the right direction and though he cannot be considered representative of German Protestants as a whole, still he exercises an enormous influence.

The Maria Laach meeting did express the general and deep desire for union and the coming Council is certainly welcomed by German non-Catholics. Many of them expressed the hope that the new Council would continue where the Vatican left off, clarifying the nature of the Church and of episcopal authority, and prayed that the Council, while preserving the substance of Catholic dogma, would avoid any decision which might make it more difficult for Protestants to accept Rome's authority.

The difficulties of reunion are enormous, the greatest of all being the disunity and disagreement among Protestants themselves. We speak of German Protestants and German Protestant theology as though corresponding to the terms Catholics and Catholic theology, but this can be misleading. German Protestants include men who do not believe in an after-life and who reject Christ's Resurrection as a myth. Each theologian is an authority, or rather, there is no authority in their Church, but speculation by the experts and bewilderment or abandonment of thought by the others.

Even in Germany, where Catholic-Protestant relations are more advanced than in any other country, the task of reunion demands heroic patience and hope. But our Lord, who prayed before His death "That they may all be one; that they too may be one in us, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; so that the world may come to believe that it is thou who hast sent me," also said "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me; you, therefore, must go out, making disciples of all nations, and baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all the commandments which I have given you. And behold I am with you all through the days that are coming, until the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii, 18 ff.). He is with us, turning to good the evil that men do, not only in Germany, but elsewhere too, instilling a longing for unity in the minds of men and creating the conditions which favour it. What separates us has often very little to do with real theological differences but is rather based upon a tradition of mutual fear, suspicion, distrust and dislike. The *Una Sancta* has shown great wisdom in making prayer and penance for unity its first aim, for charity is born of prayer and penance, and until Christians try to love one

another, then attempts at reunion are a waste of time; charity, on the other hand, "sustains, believes, hopes, endures till the last".

GERARD HUGHES, S.J.

THE CHURCH IN THE POOR MAN'S THEOLOGY

THE structure of our mortal bodies does not constitute the whole man: the external materialization of her vitality never adequately expresses the fullness of her inner life;" so writes Cardinal Suhard of the Church, and he goes on to examine that "growth which involves some measure of dying" and "those eliminations which she made in time to which she owes her series of triumphs". It was a momentous pastoral defining the position of the Church in 1948, a Church which changes as a tree changes in its seasons and yet maintains its identity.

For ourselves we cannot but be conscious that when we think of the Church our concept of her is coloured by *Mystici Corporis* as an earlier generation was by the question of papal infallibility: but we are the perhaps one per cent who read the dogma books, the popular theologies and the reviews. And the other ninety-nine per cent? They have a textbook too, one which is the foundation of their religious knowledge (no matter how many sermons, or articles in the Press or booklets seek to modify it later), they have studied it for years, and many of them regard it as immutable and infallible—it is, of course, their school catechism.

Immutable it seems to be, at least to the English Catholic, almost the identical words and phrases that his father and grandfather learned by rote back to the time of Napoleon, and back beyond that, in form at least, to 1649.

But every book, like its author, is a child of its age and nation: so, too, the catechism, and it is instructive to make some comparisons between the old catechisms and our own, between those of the mainland of Europe and those of our islands.

It is a study that can be conducted in any part of the catechism, doctrinal, moral or practical, and it will reveal between times and countries a difference in emphasis in a dogma, a particular moral weakness of a century, or a clue to a nation's pious practices: only the country of the penitential processions could put as its third catechism question, "What is the sign of the Christian? It is the holy Cross", and only one country could ask "Should children consult their parents on their intended marriage?"

Perhaps in the teaching about the Church itself more than in anything else these variations are revealed: what the author of a catechism sought to teach about the Church in the seventeenth century differs from that of the nineteenth or twentieth, differs in France or Germany from that in the British Isles.

Let us look first, then, at some of the ideas that were prevalent in the immediate post-Reformation period: what did the catechists of that time wish to teach about the Church? Practically only this: a defence against Luther's concept of it as an invisible and spiritual society. For the Catholic catechist she was a visible society which excludes heretics and schismatics, she had her four marks of identity, and she had authority to teach: thus the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. The Douay Catechism (1649) proved itself a loyal son of Trent: here is its definition of the Church, "the congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ and His vicar on earth", again the four marks, again the emphasis on its authority, "Can the Church err?", and again the question of exclusiveness, "We are bound to believe her because God commands us under pain of being looked on as heathens and unbelievers".

A catechism published in Newcastle-on-Tyne in 1790 put it all in a nutshell:

"Which religion is the Catholic Church?" "Our religion."

"Is ours the old religion?" "Yes."

In England we have up to this day a catechism attributed to Challoner, and which has its present form since 1823: most of its questions and answers will be familiar to anyone who has been schooled in England in the past 140 years. Here again the basic teaching on the Church is that of Trent and the Douay: the Church is the union of the faithful under one head,

Christ, and the visible head, the pope, it has its four marks and it is an infallible teaching authority; only the questions on exclusiveness have been dropped, and somewhere after 1870 a new question is added on Papal Infallibility.

Across the Irish sea Bishop Butler's catechism followed the traditional themes, "Where are true Christians to be found? Only in the true Church, the congregation of the faithful." Then the question of its marks, and its exclusiveness—"Do good works without faith insure salvation whatever Church or religion one professes?" There was however another idea included which seems very modern—a personal approach—"What advantages have we in the true faith?"

From this review of the past let us go on to an examination of our contemporaries. The post-war period has produced a spate of national catechisms: Ireland, 1951; Scotland, 1954; France, 1947; Germany, 1957. As we consider them we will remember that the doctrines of Trent remain true, although perhaps some of them are less important than in 1566, but we are in a world that has changed: it is a world that has learned to be suspicious of authoritarian rule and whose watchword is "Democracy": a world that Marx has sought to bisect and *Mystici Corporis* has sought to unite.

The Irish and Scottish may be regarded as transitional between the traditional and modern ideas of the Church: both define her as a visible society, give her four apologetic marks at some length, and maintain her authority as a teaching body—and both conceive her as exclusive. Our interest lies in what they add to Challoner and Butler: The Irish has an answer that defines the Church also as the Mystical Body and the Scottish (which is a long catechism of 700 questions) gives a whole section of thirteen questions to it: what our Lord and St Paul teach about it; what are the results of our union with Christ and our duties; and why must we love it—"Because Christ is in His Church". Both also discuss the role of the bishops (and, in an identically worded question, their authority). New ideas we may call them except that the seventeenth-century Douay had two similar questions in its compass (although not under the section devoted to the Church). "We must show especial love to the members of the Church because they are the mystical

body of Christ," and "Yes, it is a sin to disobey our bishops"—questions which were for one reason or another dropped in the later catechisms. Finally both the Irish and Scottish consider the role of the laity in the Church, how can the faithful help the Church; to which the Irish replies, "By defending it against attack and by being active members of Catholic societies", and the Scottish, "By loyalty in obeying her and by their zeal in Catholic Action"—and so a new concept is enshrined.

The French carries the evolution a stage further: before attempting a definition there is the question, "Is Jesus Christ still with us?—Yes, in the Catholic Church". It is a catechism which seeks to "remove the barriers between catechism and Gospels, catechism and liturgy, catechism and Christian life". After this promising start the traditional forms are observed, the four marks, the exclusiveness, but again it is the additions that are interesting: the bishops, yes, but "they are aided in their apostolate by the priests and especially the parish priests", and also "by the faithful whose apostolate is called Catholic Action".

The German, it would seem, is in no way dominated by the Tridentine approach. Its Church is not the citadel with its defensive walls excluding and protecting, and its authority to rule without error: rather it is a Living Thing, something of our Lord Himself at work in the world: Christ wins life for it and delegates it to be His teacher, priest and shepherd. Its holy duty is to celebrate the worship of God and administer the sacraments, to bless and consecrate, to lead and teach. Of course, pope and bishops, marks and infallibility are all mentioned but they are not laboured: the approach is entirely new, it is "an expression of the fullness of her inner life".

Our turn is to come: it is to be hoped that our new catechism will be inspired by its contemporaries and prove worthy of its destiny.

T. W. BURKE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CONFIRMATION BY CURATE HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN

A certain hospital containing a large maternity block has for its "official" chaplain, responsible alike to the bishop and the hospital authorities, the local parish priest, but the actual charge is wholly entrusted to his curate. Has the curate the faculty to confirm there? If so, can he lawfully exercise it habitually, even though the parish priest is theoretically no less "available" when calls come to the presbytery, but would normally find it very burdensome to respond to them in person? (R. B.)

REPLY

The first question can be solved only by a decision of the parish priest's own Ordinary. The faculty to which it refers was granted by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, 24 November 1956, in response to a petition from the Hierarchy of England and Wales. The petition asked that power to confirm dying children in maternity hospitals and in institutions or hospital wards reserved to children be granted to the chaplain or priest specially and stably charged with their spiritual care, because of the general difficulty of summoning the parish priest. The indult granted the faculty as requested, but upon two conditions. The first of these stipulates for the valid exercise of the faculty that it be exercised personally by the chaplain "stably appointed" to the said institution, and, if there be several, by the first of them exclusively. The second requires for the lawful use of the faculty that no bishop be available, and that "the parish priest himself cannot be had, or that he be legitimately impeded from conferring the sacrament". The answer to the first question depends therefore on which of the two priests is *canonically* the "stably appointed" chaplain. We emphasize the word "*canonically*", because there would seem to be nothing to prevent the appointment of the parish priest as "official"

chaplain for civic purposes, and of his curate as canonical chaplain, stably charged with the spiritual care of the patients.

In order, however, to satisfy the requirements of the indult, the appointment of a curate as hospital chaplain must, in our opinion, be made by the local Ordinary, as provided in canon 476, §2, not simply by the parish priest in his allocation of parochial duties.¹ It would appear from our correspondent's statement that no such division of responsibility has been made by the Ordinary in the case he describes. If so, the curate has no faculty to confirm, no matter how difficult it may be for the parish priest to answer the calls. The remedy must be sought from the Ordinary who, if he thinks one is called for, can extend the faculty to the curate merely by assigning to him, at least for canonical purposes, the stable charge of the hospital.

On the assumption that such an appointment has been made, the answer to the second question depends on the interpretation of the clause in the indult which requires, for the lawful use of the chaplain's faculty, that the parish priest be "legitimately impeded" from using his own faculty. Since the validity of the sacrament is not here at stake, there is room for the application of the principle of probabilism and therefore for a more liberal interpretation. Provided, therefore, that the parish priest can honestly decide, with reasonable probability, that he already has as many duties as his age or health permit him prudently to undertake, he need not scruple to declare himself habitually impeded from answering calls from the hospital to which his curate can well attend and which involve no more than the administration of confirmation to dying infants.

PASCHAL COMMUNION—A TWOFOLD PRECEPT

Does it follow from canon 859 that the paschal precept is formally not one but two distinct precepts, so that two sins are involved in culpable failure to communicate in the course of a year? (J. W.)

¹ So also Dziadosz, *The Provisions of the Decree "Spiritus Sancti Munera"* (Washington 1958), p. 112: "The disposition of parochial activities by the pastor to the effect that assistant A will take charge of the hospital or orphanage within the territorial limits does not fulfill the demand inherent in the phrase 'stabilius addicto' of the indult."

REPLY

Conc. Lateran. IV, c. 21: "Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata saltem semel in anno fideliter confiteatur proprio sacerdoti, . . . suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha Eucharistiae sacramentum, nisi forte de consilio proprii sacerdotis ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab eius perceptione duxerit abstinendum."¹

Canon 859, §1: "Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis, idest ad rationis usum, pervenerit, debet semel in anno, saltem in Paschate, Eucharistiae sacramentum recipere, nisi forte de consilio proprii sacerdotis, ob aliquam rationabilem causam, ad tempus ab eius perceptione duxerit abstinendum."

§4: "Praeceptum paschalis communionis adhuc urget, si quis illud praescripto tempore, quavis de causa, non impleverit."

The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The somewhat different wording of the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), on which the Code law is based, left room for doubt as to whether the precept was twofold and various opinions were held;² but there has been fairly general agreement since the time of St Alphonsus that the precept is virtually twofold, in the sense that it imposes a twofold obligation, and modern commentators are morally unanimous in so interpreting canon 859.³ The fourth paragraph of this canon might indeed seem to imply a single precept, inasmuch as it speaks of the precept of *paschal* communion as continuing to bind, if it has not been fulfilled during the prescribed time; but, as Coronata observes,⁴ the initial paragraph makes it clear enough that there is question of a twofold precept which prescribes, first, that all shall communicate not less than once a year, and secondly that, if they communicate only once, they must do so during the paschal period.

¹ Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, n. 437.

² Cf. Lugo, *De Eucharistia*, disp. 16, n. 62 ff.

³ Cf. Coronata, *De Sacram.*, I, n. 322; Cappello, *De Sacram.*, I (1953), n. 424; Regatillo, *Ius Sacramentarium*, n. 360; Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa T.M.*, II, n. 693; Mahoney, *Priests' Problems*, qu. 110, p. 146.

⁴ Loc. cit.

The distinction is not merely juridical, but has a sound theological basis. Our Lord's solemn warning, "Amen, amen, I say to you: Except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you",¹ is commonly interpreted by theologians as imposing on all the faithful who have come to the use of reason a divine command to communicate sacramentally from time to time.² The Church, to whom our Lord left the precise determination of this obligation, has made annual communion the minimum requirement. The canon law of annual communion is therefore part divine, part ecclesiastical—an ecclesiastical law with a divine foundation. The prescription of paschal communion, on the contrary, is certainly purely ecclesiastical. The former obligation is primary and prescribed for its own sake, whereas the latter is secondary and prescribed with a view to the fulfilment of the former. It would seem therefore that they cannot formally constitute a single precept, or at least a single obligation, for they are intrinsically distinct in origin and purpose.

Because the paschal obligation is subordinate to the annual obligation, a single communion suffices to fulfil both, provided it be made within the prescribed paschal period. On the other hand, both obligations are grave, and therefore one who fails inexcusably to communicate during the paschal period incurs grave guilt, whether or not he subsequently satisfies the annual obligation by communicating before the beginning of the next paschal period;³ and, if he does not, he aggravates his sin by a further and even graver default.

We say "aggravates his sin", because it does not necessarily follow that he doubles it. A sin consists formally and essentially in a perverse act of will, and therefore it can only be multiplied in so far as the will-act which is its cause is multiplied.⁴ Now, the objects of the two obligations in question are certainly distinct enough to permit of separate will-acts, as when a person

¹ John vi, 54.

² Cf. Cappello, op. cit., nn. 420-1.

³ According to the general teaching of modern authors, the year is to be reckoned from the beginning of one paschal period to the beginning of the next.

⁴ There is some dispute on this point, but, in our opinion, Vermeersch is right in insisting (*Theol. Mor.*, I, n. 411) that this is the only real principle of multiplication of sins. Multiplicity of the objects willed can only result in multiplication of the sin, in so far as they require distinct acts of will.

culpably omits to communicate during the paschal period and then, by a distinct act of will, decides to ignore also the annual obligation which still persists. But the objects are not so formally distinct as to be incapable of being willed as one moral whole. Hence, a person who, by a single and morally persevering act of will, inexcusably neglects to communicate at all in a given year commits, in our opinion, a single sin.¹ In confession, it will certainly be sufficient to avow it as a single sin, namely, that of not having made the required annual communion.

THE FREQUENCY OF VENIAL SINS

How often does even the just man sin venially? (M. T.)

REPLY

"A just man shall fall seven times and shall rise again."² This estimate of the inspired writer, to which the question implicitly refers, was evidently not meant to be taken mathematically, nor will our questioner expect us to attempt even an approximately mathematical answer. All that is certain from divine revelation is that "in many things we all offend".³ If however we turn to the great theologians who have explored the nature of sin, we are driven to the conclusion that, venially at least, even the just man offends much more often than the faithful in general appear to realize.

From the material point of view, all sin, mortal or venial, is essentially an inordinate act, one which is out of order in relation to the ultimate end of human action. Consequently, as St Thomas Aquinas explains,⁴ the intrinsic difference between mortal and venial sin must be sought in the diversity of the form of inordination, which may be substantial or merely acci-

¹ "As a rule, we believe that those who do not make their Easter duty during a year are guilty of but one sin, since they do not think of distinct violations" (McHugh-Callan, *Moral Theology*, II, n. 2592).

² Proverbs xxiv, 16.

³ James iii, 2.

⁴ *Summa Theol.*, Ia IIae, qu. 72, a. 5; qu. 88, a. 1.

dental. It is substantial when it involves a complete aversion from man's final end, God, by turning away to some created good which is incompatible with direction of one's life to Him. It is accidental when it is limited to "ea quae sunt ad finem", impairing or delaying the directness of one's advance to Him, but not reversing it. The former is mortal sin, the latter venial.

It will be seen that the notion of sin is fully verified only in mortal sin, so that venial sin can be called sin only in an imperfect sense. All it has in common with mortal sin is the fact that it is not wholly in order. But the point of importance to the present question is that there is matter for sin, at least in this incomplete sense, in every act which deviates from the order dictated by right reason. When it is appreciated that, in any concrete case, the order dictated by right reason is as finely determined as the path of orthodoxy in Chesterton's memorable description of it, that the only right way to God is, in the words of the Curé of Ars, "dead straight, like a bullet", it will be realized that the possibilities of materially sinful deviation, be it only by dilly-dallying on the way to God, are legion.

But the question is concerned with formal rather than merely material sin, and for formal sin some degree of deliberation at some point is certainly required. It can be readily conceded that there is no *present* deliberation in many, if not most, of the just man's minor deviations from the order of right reason. From this we are apt to conclude that they are not imputable to him as sins, and can be written off as unavoidable manifestations of fallen nature. In the opinion of many of the greatest theologians, however, such a conclusion is not only too hasty, but quite unwarranted.

St Thomas, in agreement with Peter Lombard, St Albert the Great, St Bonaventure and others,¹ teaches that unruly movements of the sensitive appetites, even when indeliberate, are imputable as sin, if not in themselves, then at least in their voluntary cause.² Sin, he argues, can be found in any potency whose act can be voluntary and inordinate. But an act of sensuality can be voluntary, inasmuch as it is natural to the

¹ For a good summary of their slightly variant doctrines, cf. Lottin, *Morale Fondamentale*, I, pp. 100 ff.

² Op. cit., qu. 74, a. 3.

sensitive appetite to be moved by the will, and therefore there can be sin even in a mere movement of sense appetite. To the objection that what is unavoidable cannot be sinful and that inordinate acts of sensuality are unavoidable owing to its perpetual corruption, he answers that the inordinate inclination of fallen nature does not deprive one's reasonable will of its power to repress individual inordinate motions of sensuality, detected in advance, e.g. by turning one's thoughts to other things. He remarks that when one does this, it can itself give rise to an inordinate movement, as when one turns to study in order to evade a fleshly temptation, only to be surprised by an unpremeditated movement of vainglory; and he therefore admits that inordinate movements cannot be avoided altogether. "But," he adds, "the mere fact that one can avoid them individually is enough to give them the character of voluntary sin," and even though a movement which forestalls reason is not a sin in the complete sense, because it is not a completely human act, it is nevertheless a venial sin.

In St Thomas's view, therefore, we are unduly optimistic if we imagine that we can disown responsibility for all those endless effects of fallen nature, those spasms of irritation, jealousy, self-conceit, etc., which we detect, if at all, only after they have occurred. It is true that, inasmuch as there is no present deliberation in them, we commit no actual sin then and there. It is true also that we are not to blame for the inherited defect which is part cause of our unpremeditated lapses, and that we cannot, without a miracle of grace, forestall them altogether. But there is not one of them individually which, if we made such use as right reason demands of the means placed at our disposal by God's ordinary providence, we could not avoid or repress; and, were our effort as sustained as it should be, the total number of our defaults could certainly be reduced to a notable degree. If their root cause is part involuntary, i.e. the inherited disharmony of our nature, it is also part voluntary, i.e. our wilful failure to undertake and sustain the remedial and preventive effort made possible by divine grace. Even therefore when our individual lapses are not imputable *in se*, through lack of actual deliberation, they are globally imputable *in causa*.

It may be objected that the precise point at issue is the

frequency of repetition of venial sins in the just man, and that a generic causal fault of the above kind is a vice or sinful state, rather than a series of repeated sinful acts. There is some truth in this, for the causal fault is not, properly speaking, multiplied by every indeliberate lapse for which it is ultimately responsible. It should be remembered, however, that it is multiplied every time that the just man adverts to his habitual sloth and wilfully neglects to take effective measures to shake himself free from it. But whether the life of the just man is one long series of repeated venial sins, most of them imputable only *in causa*, or one prolonged venial sin of spiritual sloth, aggravated occasionally by more or less deliberate lapses which are imputable *in se*, the conclusion would appear to be that even the just man is a very frequent sinner, and that the saints are not indulging in pious exaggeration when they bewail the multitude of their sins. It is we rather than they who tend to under-estimate our sinfulness.

L. L. McR.

GOOD FRIDAY PRAYER FOR THE JEWS

What change is to be made in the words of the prayer (No. 8) for the Jews on Good Friday? (J. C. A.)

REPLY

The Pope when taking part in the Liturgy at the church of the Holy Cross in Rome last Good Friday suppressed the words *perfidia* and *perfidia* in the prayer among the *Orationes Solemnnes* for the Jews. Before the revised rite of Holy Week came into use (1955) a rubric existed in the Roman Missal directing that after the introduction to this prayer, *Oremus* was not to be said, nor *Flectamus genua*, nor *Levate*. This rubric was omitted in the new rite. The practice of omitting the genuflexion—with the fanciful explanation that this was done to mark Christian horror at the mockery of our Lord in his Passion by a genuflexion—was an innovation of the ninth century when the people in unchristian animosity had refused to heed the deacon's

injunction *Flectamus genua*. The 1955 rite did not, however, change the word *perfidia*, though modern scholarship had shown that neither historically nor philologically was it the correct word to use of the Jews. Indeed in 1948 in answer to a query about the real meaning of the word in the prayer the Sacred Congregation of Rites had replied (10 June 1948): "Non improbari, in translationibus in linguas vulgares, locutiones quarum sensus sit *infidelitas, infideles in credendo*." And so modern translators use the English word "unbelieving" as the best translation of the real meaning of *perfidia* in the prayer—the want of faith of the Jews. Now controversy is no longer possible on this question. Following the action of the Pope the text has been altered and the new version transmitted to the bishops to be passed on to their priests.

The text now is: (a) in the invitatory, *Oremus et pro Judaeis: ut . . .*; (b) in the prayer, *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui Judaeos etiam a tua misericordia. . .*

The text of *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae Instauratus* should, accordingly, be corrected before it is used on Good Friday.

ANTICIPATION OF MATINS

Priests who are members of certain societies (e.g. the Missionary Union of the Clergy) are given the privilege of anticipating from midday the recitation of Matins and Lauds of the following day "dummodo tamen Officium diei jam persolverint". Missioners, however, have from the Propaganda Congregation this faculty without this added restrictive clause. May those who have the faculty from some association and are not missioners assume that the restrictive clause is now waived? (X).

REPLY

As the privilege of anticipating the Office has a clause limiting it which begins with the conjunction "dummodo" the restriction must be regarded as concerning the *validity* of the use of the rescript and not merely its lawfulness (C.J.C., canon

39). If the privilege is granted to missionaries, it is because of their very special circumstances which may occasionally require that they be permitted to begin one day's Office before finishing that of the preceding day, a request which *per se* is scarcely a reasonable or normal one, and the grant of such must be regarded as exceptional. In any case one may not conclude from the concession of such a favour to missionaries that the restrictive clause which is added for those who are not missionaries is no longer considered as binding. Only the Holy See can determine that; the legislator has the right to limit any derogation from his law that he chooses to grant as a favour.

SERVER AT DIALOGUE MASS

Should the server of a dialogue Mass, at which the congregation follows the correct ceremonial, follow the old rule of kneeling all the time (except at the Gospels) when not engaged in any action requiring him to move about? (X.)

REPLY

The serving of Mass is dealt with only incidentally and with little detail in the rubrics of the Missal. Its details are not fixed and are determined by applying general principles of ceremonial, by analogy with the duties of the deacon, subdeacon, and servers at solemn Mass, by some few decisions of S.R.C. and by local usage. Now that people present at Mass are beginning to take their proper active part in the ceremony, it would certainly be preferable that the server did the same. Indeed he can and should be a leader for the congregation in those parts of the ceremony that he shares with them.

CALENDAR FOR MASS IN A CONVENT

If a secular priest is chaplain to nuns of the Third Order of St Francis is he bound to use the Franciscan Missal or may he follow his own diocesan *Ordo*? (R.)

REPLY

It depends on whether such sisters have a proper calendar or not. Regular Orders (cf. *C.F.C.*, canon 488), together with the nuns and sisters of these Orders, must have an entirely proper calendar. So must Congregations or Institutes of both sexes which are approved by the Holy See and are constituted under one general head (Superior General) if they are bound to the recitation of the Divine Office.

Congregations or Institutes—whether approved by the Holy See or by the Ordinary of the diocese only—if they are not constituted under one General Superior have not a proper calendar. Their calendar is that of the diocese with the addition—in accordance with the rubrics—of the special Offices that have been granted to them by the Holy See. All this was legislated for by a decree of *S.R.C.* of 28 February 1914 (No. 4312). If, then, these religious of the Third Order have a proper calendar a priest celebrating Mass in their chapel must follow that calendar (cf. *S.R.C.*, 3927¹); if they have not, he should follow the diocesan *Ordo* (except, of course, for any special feasts or privileges granted by the Holy See to this Third Order).

J. B. O'C.

BOOK REVIEWS

Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament. By R. de Vaux, o.p. Pp. 347. (Ed. du Cerf, Paris, 1958. No price stated.)

Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels. By X. Léon-Dufour, s.j. Translated by R. J. O'Connell, s.j. Pp. 21 and 3 folding charts. (Desclee, Tournai, 1957. No price stated.)

New Testament Introduction. By A. Wikenhauser. Translated by J. Cunningham. Pp. xviii + 580. (Herder & Herder and Nelson, 1958. 50s.)

INTRODUCTIONS to the Bible are not exciting books. For interest, practicability and spiritual nourishment, the reader will naturally

turn to an exegetical commentary or to a work of Biblical theology. Yet exegesis and theology will themselves be useless if they are not based on a thorough investigation into the background of the Biblical books in general and of each one in particular: its author, destination, time and place of composition, occasion and purpose, literary form, sources, unity and relation with other writings. Only the accurate knowledge of these circumstances will allow the reader to enter fully into the mind of the sacred author, and so to understand exactly what it is that he is saying. It is the task of books of introduction to provide such a background. And if anyone imagines that this work has been done sufficiently, once and for all, in the past, he should re-read the words of Pius XII:

It is a mistake to maintain, as some who fail to appreciate the conditions of biblical study do maintain, that nothing remains for the modern Catholic exegete to add to the achievements of Christian antiquity. On the contrary, these times of ours have raised many problems which call for further study and examination, and serve as a powerful stimulus to the energy and zeal of the interpreters of today. . . . Let the interpreter therefore use every care, and take advantage of every indication provided by the most recent research, in an endeavour to discern the distinctive genius of the sacred writer, his condition in life, the age in which he lived, the written or oral sources he may have used, and the literary forms he employed. He will thus be able better to discover who the sacred writer was and what he meant by what he wrote. (*Divino Afflante.*)

Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament is a fine example of such recent research being pressed into service. The archaeological investigation of the ancient East is, comparatively speaking, still an infant science, yet it has already thrown more light on the Bible than many of its sister sciences, for the background which it reconstructs gives, as it were, a third dimension to the Biblical text. This is certainly the effect produced by the present work, in which Père de Vaux makes use of the vast amount of material unearthed in the last fifty years to bring back to life the tribal, domestic and civil organization of the Old Testament. The nomadic way of life, marriage customs, the attitude to death, the education and upbringing of children, slavery, finance, public works, the monarchy, the legal system, the economy, the calendar—these are some of the elements which made up the milieu in which the Old Testament was written, and they are here made available in concise and very readable form. The book is the first of a two-volume work, the second of which

will deal with the military and religious background of ancient Israel. Together they will form the beginning of a series of studies designed to supplement the *Bible de Jérusalem*. This edition of the Bible has already been widely acclaimed as a compendium of all that is best in modern Biblical scholarship. With these companion volumes to open out its excellent introductions and footnotes, the student of Scripture can almost absolve himself from the need of acquiring further books.

The *Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels* is a more specialized work of introduction, designed to help the student understand something of the complex relationship that exists between the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. Too often the close parallelism between these three evangelists has been used as an excuse to neglect their individual nuances, and to disregard completely the context of their words in an attempt to produce an artificial harmonization which bears no relation to the message of any of them. For the Gospels are not mere biographies of Christ, but individual interpretations of the Christian faith, whose meaning becomes clear only when they are treated individually and closely compared so that the slightest variation may reveal the author's purpose and approach. This comparison is done most conveniently by means of a "synopsis" in which the Gospels are placed before the reader in parallel columns. Of the various synopses that have been produced, Fr Dufour's is without question the most vivid and informative. Each Gospel is assigned a separate folder, in which the content is indicated by a series of headings enclosed within rectangles which vary in size according to the number of verses concerned, and where each rectangle is ingeniously coloured to indicate at a glance whether it is proper to Matthew (red), Mark (blue) or Luke (yellow), or whether by a combination of these colours it is common to two of them (purple, green and orange) or all three (brown). Coloured borders, discs and pennants at the side indicate the existence of similar passages in the other Gospels and their context, and a system of signs (arrows, crosses, circles, squares, triangles and asterisks) gives in an unobtrusive way further information about the place, audience, setting and effect of Christ's words. A brief text of twenty-one pages explains how the work is to be used, and gives some examples of the light it can throw on the detailed study of the Gospels. Its description sounds complicated, and indeed it requires considerable application to assimilate the information it is designed to give. The first sight of the folding charts, with their profusion of colours and symbols, might even deter the earnest student from looking any further. He may be assured that patient familiarity with them will prove

them to be the perfect key to an ever deeper appreciation of the Synoptic Gospels.

By far the most significant of the three books under review is the translation of Professor Wikenhauser's introduction to the books of the New Testament. This not because it says anything that will be new to those who have kept abreast of recent Catholic work on the subject in France and Germany, but because it makes that work available to the English-speaking Catholic public. Most of our handbooks give the impression that Catholic scholarship has been at a standstill for the past fifty years, and that it is sufficient to pass down, from one generation to the next, the classical but defensive views which were being put forward by Cornely and Knabenbauer at the turn of the century. Yet those fifty years have seen a complete revolution in Biblical study, not least in reference to the New Testament, and to disregard the fact is both foolish and dangerous. The great merit of this book is that it does not automatically view all that is new as suspect, but judges it fairly and objectively, accepts graciously and gratefully what has been solidly established even though it differs violently from what has been accepted as "traditional" (e.g. on the date of the Gospels, the ending of Mark, the authorship of Hebrews and II Peter, the identity of James and Jude), and states quite frankly the pros and cons of problems which have not yet been satisfactorily solved (e.g. on the unity of the Apocalypse and the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles). It is refreshing, for instance, to see a question like Form Criticism, which as recently as 1953 could be rejected out of hand as "a welter of unfounded hypotheses put down as facts with a breath-taking naïvety" (E. Gutwenger, s.j., in the *Catholic Commentary*), treated not only with sympathy but with recognition of the fact that it is the indispensable key to the understanding of the New Testament: "The most important premiss of Form Criticism is fundamentally correct. . . . The individual sayings of Jesus and the individual stories must be separated from the framework in which they are embedded. . . . Only in this way can (their) original proper significance be established" (p. 272). With its ample and up-to-date bibliographies, the book is to be welcomed as a perfect summary of recent New Testament scholarship. The translator has done his work carefully and readably, and the publisher has elegantly (though the serious misplacement of p. 25 should not have escaped the official reader's eye). The English public may be grateful for the agreement by which the great firms of Herder & Herder and Nelson are collaborating to make the work of continental scholars such as this available in translation.

H. J. R.

Q

The Mass in Meditation. By Theodor Schnitzler. Volume I. Pp. xvi + 247. (B. Herder Book Co., 1959. 34s.)

For many of us priests the daily celebration of Mass is sadly affected by two things especially: the human infirmity whereby even what is most sacred, most precious, tends to lose its value by use, and the pressure of external circumstances which often forces us to carry out this profoundly sacred task in a hurried manner. And so we fail to understand the words we pronounce and miss the deep spiritual content of the rite of Mass.

The Mass in Meditation should be for those of us who use it for our morning prayer an effective corrective of our indifference, and cannot fail to make the celebration of Mass more meaningful and meritorious for us.

The book was written originally by Fr Schnitzler, the liturgist of the seminary of Cologne-Bensberg, for theological students, but it is of immense value for all priests, prepared as it was, after many years' study of the theology of the Mass and the history of the Roman rite, that "nutritious bread might be made from what the garnered sheaves contained".

Fr Schnitzler's meditations, or spiritual readings, are not merely pietistic, they are soundly based on the fruits of modern scholarship on the Mass, especially on the classical study of its history by Fr J. A. Jungmann, s.j., *Missarum Sollemnia*. Indeed, this prince of modern liturgists has written a foreword for *The Mass in Meditation* in which he says:

the great discovery which the reader of these meditations can make with the author is that behind the simple words of the Canon of the Mass the entire spiritual world of the Christian early ages becomes alive: a great concept of God, a noble picture of Christ, the sight of the Church in its unity, of the Church triumphant and those still on their earthly pilgrimage, the monumental praying and seeking for God in an heroic age.

This first volume of *The Mass in Meditation*—the second is yet to come—is devoted almost entirely to the Canon of the Roman rite. After an introduction *Testamentum Domini*—some considerations on the nature of the Mass—there are meditations on the text and rite of the Canon, and then on the text and rite of the Consecration. In these the author deals with consummate skill not only with the thought-content of each part of the great Eucharistic Prayer but with each phrase and word, enabling the reader to savour the beauty and significance of that wonderful composition of the golden age of the Roman rite.

We owe the excellent English version of this invaluable book to Mgr Rudolph Kraus, who has certainly done a great service for those who do not read German. The very high price of the book—not a very long one nor presenting any special difficulty for the printer—seems unreasonable, even in these days when the price of books is really getting out of hand, but those who buy the book will not regret the outlay.

The Mass of the Roman Rite. By Rev. Joseph A. Jungmann, s.j. New Revised and Abridged Edition in one volume. Translated by Rev. Francis A. Brunner, c.ss.r.; revised by Charles K. Riepe. Pp. x + 567. (Burns & Oates, 1959. 70s.)

THIS book has an interesting history. The famous *Missarum Sollemnia* of Fr Jungmann we owe to Hitler's persecution of Austria. It was written during the war years in a tiny farming village close to the Danube between Linz and Vienna where Fr Jungmann took refuge after the removal of the theological faculty of the University of Innsbruck by Hitler's regime and the closing of the Jesuit College in October 1939, and has become the most celebrated and authoritative work on the genetic history of the Roman rite. It appeared in German in 1948, and already in 1949 there was a second revised edition. It was from this that the first English translation was made by Fr Francis Brunner, c.ss.r., and published by Benziger Brothers in 1951. Those who do not read German owe a great debt of gratitude to the translator and the publishers. *Missarum Sollemnia*, either in its original edition or its two-volume English translation, is a formidable book. Its author told us in his foreword to the English edition that he "wanted to build a solid structure that did not rest on conjecture and on the unexamined acceptance of the data of earlier authors". He has indeed succeeded in this scholarly aim. He dealt with his subject so exhaustively that the two volumes of the English translation run into more than a thousand pages and the critical apparatus for this immense labour, given in the thousands of footnotes, is unbelievable in its extent and complexity.

That lovers of the Liturgy might be encouraged to read this wonderful book, it was a happy thought to have an abbreviated version made of the English translation, omitting the vast body of references which cover the pages of the original book. Better still, this new book is not a mere abbreviation—it is much more. It was prepared under the aegis of Fr Jungmann himself by one of his pupils at the Collegium Canisianum at Innsbruck, Charles K. Riepe, of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, who (the author tells us) "was already best prepared for the task". This arrangement made it

possible to have the book revised and brought up to date, and this is what Mr Riepe tells us of his plan:

The purpose in view was to preserve the substance of the German original but to eliminate what could be sacrificed to expediency. Only occasionally were larger sections omitted, as in the chapter "Praeparatio ad Missam". New footnotes were added where it seemed advisable and occasionally other devices were added to facilitate understanding, such as the diagram on the development of the various forms of the Mass. And, of course, footnotes from the original which seem essential to illuminate the text as well as those which are simply interesting have been retained. At the same time care was taken to ensure that this edition is fully up to date and in accord with the fourth German edition—which appeared in the late winter of 1958. The chapter on the Rite of Commingling, which Fr Jungmann prepared for the present edition, is certainly the latest word on that difficult subject.

Mr Riepe adds that Fr Jungmann checked the manuscript and offered suggestions.

Here then is a great opportunity to drink deep of Fr Jungmann's amazing erudition, in a simpler form than *Missarum Sollemnia* and at half the price.

The Mass, A Liturgical Commentary. By Canon A. Croegart. Vol. II. Pp. x + 311. (Burns & Oates, 1959. 30s.)

Books on the rite of the Mass abound in our times. Happily the old-style book, written by people who were unquestionably pious but not very scholarly, is a thing of the past. It was a lineal descendant of the treatises on the Mass based on allegorical interpretations—some of them very fanciful indeed—which were in vogue in the Middle Ages at a time when a scientific investigation of rites was very rare indeed. The materials for it were then unknown, or at best available only with great difficulty, and in any case that type of research was unheard of at that period. All that is changed and now we have a number of excellent books, the fruit of diligent labour, which place at the disposal of the clergy and the educated laity, in a very readable form, the fruits of modern scholarship. Canon Croegart's book is one of these, written, he tells us, "to provide a methodical and practical book for the clergy, one which will be useful both for their own instruction and their apostolate".

The author is a well-known Belgian liturgist, with many books to his credit, and as one-time Professor of Liturgy at the Grand

Séminaire of Malines his competence to write about the Mass is unquestionable.

The Mass is an abridged translation—very competently made by J. Holland Smith—of Canon Croegart's three-volume book *Les Rites et les Prières du Saint Sacrifice de la Messe*, first published in 1938 (second edition 1948); and the English version was made under the direction of the author himself, allowing him to make any changes he desired, and also permitting use to be made of the latest official documents, including the S.R.C. Instruction of 1958, *De Sacra Musica et Liturgia*. The first volume of the English edition appeared in October 1958 and dealt with the "Mass of the Catechumens"; this second volume treats of the "Mass of the Faithful". In addition to explaining the texts of the *Ordo Missae* and the different ceremonies of each part of the Mass rite, Canon Croegart has several interesting and useful chapters of a theological character with a bearing on the rite, and deals at length with the history of the evolution of the Roman rite.

The English version used of the prayers of the *Ordo Missae* is that of *The Missal in Latin and English* (O'Connell-Finberg 1957 edition), with some minor changes in the Canon. One of these is certainly no improvement: the translation of *Communicantes* as "united in the same holy communion" which, despite the lower case *c*, is likely to mislead in English. In any case, the word "holy" is not in the original French. One misses in Canon Croegart's book a fuller explanation of the signs of the cross over the *oblata*—especially those after the Consecration.

The Mass gives a letter from Cardinal Montini—then *Sostituto* at the Secretariate of State of his Holiness—written by direction of Pope Pius XII to the author in 1949, acknowledging the receipt of the French edition of the book. In it the cardinal wrote:

Your book will certainly furnish valuable help to priests engaged in the sacred ministry, whose duty it is to instruct the faithful in these matters. It will make their task easier by saving them the need to consult a large number of books, the substance of which you have collected together for their use.

That sentence underlines one of the many good qualities of *The Mass*.

The Mass Through the Year. By Aemiliana Löhr. Volume II. Pp. x + 304. (Longmans, 1959. 30s.)

THIS book is the second volume of the English version—competently made by I. T. Hale—of *Das Herrenjahr*, published in 1937. The first

volume was reviewed in THE CLERGY REVIEW of May 1959. The authoress is a Benedictine nun of Holy Cross Abbey, Herstelle (North Germany).

It is not an ordinary commentary on either the rite of the Mass or on its texts during the liturgical year, but a series of reflexions on these texts by one who is intimately acquainted with the spiritual life based on the worship of the Mystical Body of Christ. The writer has a remarkable knowledge of Holy Writ and of Patristic ideas. Her thoughts will be evocative of fresh and fruitful reflexions for those who strive to build their prayer on that of the Church.

This second volume deals with the liturgical year from Holy Week to its close on the last Sunday after Pentecost. The English version has not, however, been fully adapted to the revised rites of Holy Week.

The Early Liturgy (to the Time of Gregory the Great). By Josef A. Jungmann, S.J. Translated by Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R. Pp. x + 314. (University of Notre-Dame Press, 1959.)

ONCE again we are indebted to the Liturgical Committee of the University of Notre-Dame for another volume added to the five valuable books they have already published in their Liturgical Studies.

Anything new from the pen of such a distinguished savant as Fr Jungmann cannot but arouse lively interest and great expectations among those who are devoted to the liturgical movement, and their name nowadays is, thank God, legion.

The Early Liturgy consists of a series of lectures delivered in Notre-Dame by Fr Jungmann in 1949, and (as the author tells us in a preface) the carrying out of their preparation for publication was

chiefly due to the efforts of Rev. Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R., to whom we are indebted for the translation of *Missarum Sollemnia*. He has improved the language of the lectures, supplemented the references to available English literature, added a summary here and there, as well as made occasional additions to the text itself. . . . It goes without saying that I myself have included many important contributions from the intervening nine years of liturgical-historical research which would serve to shed further light on a particular point.

And Fr Jungmann adds: "this book is not intended as a guide to scientific research in the field of liturgical history, but rather as an introduction into the manner of worship in the early Church".

These lectures are of absorbing interest. They deal with the beginnings of the Liturgy in the primitive Church, its development in the third century, in the age of Constantine, in the fifth century and up to the pontificate of St Gregory the Great—in other words the history of the Roman rite during the formative period of the heart of the Mass as we know it now.

Fr Jungmann deals not only with the Mass but also with the beginning of the formation of the calendar of the liturgical year, with the early veneration of the martyrs, and with such absorbing topics as the daily devotions of the early Christians, pagan and Christian mysteries, the impact of paganism on Christian worship, and Christological disputes and their influence on the Liturgy. Not only the Latin liturgies but also the Oriental rites receive attention.

About all these matters Fr Jungmann has written authoritatively and with a master hand, but also with that simplicity and clarity that is characteristic of really great teachers.

For this most precious book we return thanks not only to its author, but also to Fr Brunner and to the Liturgical Committee of the University of Notre-Dame who have placed at the disposal of those who did not have the privilege of hearing Fr Jungmann lecture this invaluable contribution to liturgical history.

Pour Célébrer L'Eucharistie. Edition Dominicale. By Fr Feder, s.j.

Pp. 384.

Livret du Catéchiste. By Fr Feder, s.j. Pp. 160.

(Maison Mame, Tours, 1957 and 1958. Prices not stated.)

THE number of missals edited for the use of the laity grows apace. Happily there is keen competition among the various publishers and this leads to constant efforts to improve each new edition and find new features to attract purchasers. The most important result of this welcome competition is not only the excellent editing of these books but considerable improvement in the translation of the missal texts. The editors are no longer content, as they once were, to copy very imperfect vernacular versions, but endeavour to improve with each new edition the translation, and that independently.

Pour Célébrer l'Eucharistie, a small missal for Sundays and the chief festivals, has been prepared with great skill by an expert team of liturgists, headed by Frs Feder, s.j., and F. Vermeersch. L'Institut Supérieur Catéchétique of Paris has helped in the preparation of the translation and presentation of the Order of Mass; while the liturgical mystery has been illustrated charmingly by Hervé Kerlidon, Professor of Fine Arts at Lille.

By a clever arrangement of double pagination this missal can be

used in conjunction with the famous *Missel Quotidien des Enfants* of Maison Mame.

Each liturgical season is explained and there is an excellent chapter on the ritual gestures and attitudes of Mass. The Order and prayers have been cleverly adapted rather than literally translated. It is a pleasure to see the translation of *Et cum spiritu tuo* as *Et avec vous aussi*, eschewing the hebraism. For good measure there is a selection of psalms and hymns suitable for use at Mass.

To direct a congregation at Mass so that its members may be induced *suaviter sed fortiter* to take the active part in it that the nature of the rite demands, and that the Church so ardently desires, is a pastoral act of some difficulty and delicacy; to direct a congregation of children is a much more difficult task. And it is of the utmost importance that children from their earliest years should begin to acquire a knowledge of the Mass and should be trained, gradually, according to their age and intelligence, to take their due, active part in the worship of the Mystical Body. To aid the priest, the parent, the teacher in this important work, a competent knowledge of the Liturgy, and of the mind of the Church in reference to it, is needed—the mind of the Church as set forth officially by Pope Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* and by the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites *De Musica Sacra et S. Liturgia*. This task of directing children in church demands a special technique. A good book is needed, but not many are capable of preparing such a book. Fr Feder, S.J., is a most competent person for this undertaking and he has produced a first-class book for the purpose.

He deals at length with the general principles that should guide the direction of children at Mass, comments on the chief texts of the Sacrifice for every Sunday and important feast—on the three prayers and the Epistle especially—and indicates suitable hymns, a very important matter in view of the directions of the *S.R.C.* Instruction (nn. 29, 30, 33).

This little book is so excellent that it would be very desirable if some publisher would undertake the preparation of an English version of it.

J. B. O'C.

Baroque Suite for Organ. By J. H. Reginald Dixon (Hinrichsen. 5s. 6d.)

Berceuse for Organ. By J. H. Reginald Dixon (Hinrichsen. 2s. 6d.)

Missa in honorem S. Paulini eboracensis. By J. H. Reginald Dixon. (Hinrichsen. 3s. 9d.)

DR DIXON'S *Baroque Suite* consists of four movements, each in a different mood and a different mode (designated by Greek names,

but really those of the Gregorian Chant). The initial *Toccata*, true to its title, requires neat fingerwork and bright registration. The ensuing *Pastorale* is designed for various combinations of flute stops. A brief *Verset* then intervenes before the festive *Finale*, in which the full resources of the organ are exploited. The distinctive character of the *Suite* lies in its avoidance of all chromaticism. The only accidental is an occasional B-flat. Consequently, although the work has been planned in terms of the baroque spirit in registration, its harmonic atmosphere is not that of the baroque period. Its diatonic discipline renders each of its movements especially suitable for liturgical use.

The same composer's *Berceuse*, with its passages for Celestes, Clarinet, Oboe with tremulant, etc., evokes a somewhat different atmosphere. As a note on the cover tells us: "not difficult, and of universal appeal".

Dr Dixon's latest Mass seems to display yet a third musical style, rather more traditional in harmonic idiom and melodic vocabulary. It is well within the powers of any good parish choir. The organ accompaniment, while not difficult, requires a competent player.

A. GREGORY MURRAY

Singing in God's Ear. By Dom David Nicholson, O.S.B., Monk of Mount Angel Abbey, U.S.A. (Desclée & Co., 1959. \$2.00)

THIS well-presented book of some 120 pages comes like a breath of fresh air, after the somewhat turgid controversies that have found place in the English Catholic Press over the last year. Clearly, *Singing in God's Ear* has been produced by one whose primary interest is the love of God and His worship—a love that the author is anxious for others to share. Dom David makes no reference at all to recent controversies, in spite of being, as we know personally, fully cognizant of them. He knows that the book which largely caused those controversies, that of Fr Vollaerts, S.J., has already been put out of court by his fellow Dutch Jesuit, Fr Jos. Smits van Waesberghe, S.J.

Dom David, therefore, gives us a brief and balanced compendium of the why and how of the Solesmes teaching concerning Gregorian Chant. The work is essentially practical, and so begins, as any worthwhile book on this subject must, with a chapter on Chant as Sung Prayer. In this connexion, he says:

The Chant is of a supremely prayerful and mystical nature. Perhaps it is this quality which endears it to those who, in monasteries and convents, have taken up the special art of prayer and

contemplation. It is true that a laity, lacking the teaching of theology and mysticism, will hardly open its arms to this music unless the parishes and congregations, in the hands of their pastors, are constantly being educated toward practical and progressive sanctity.

Like others who, in this country, have had the joy of teaching the Chant to ordinary folk and witnessed the way their spiritual lives have deepened as they became more familiar with it, Dom David will have none of the defeatist attitude too frequently met with in America, it seems, as well as in this country: "The Chant is dynamic. If it were not it would never have been used consistently to portray and outline some of the most powerful prayers in the Church's storehouse." In the same chapter, he admits, somewhat sadly, "Frankly, Catholics do not appreciate their own music", and points out that "when the long-playing record placed many treasures of the Gregorian repertoire at the disposal of the musical world, it was a curious fact that most of the Chant recordings were being purchased by non-Catholic music lovers!" But he refuses to be discouraged by this, and sums up his first chapter with words that the publishers saw fit to print on the book's dust-cover: "To accomplish the Chant well, it must be loved; to love it, there must be understanding."

He then sets out to impart this understanding, devoting chapters to "The Choirmaster and the Choir", voice production, simple exercises for breathing, Chant reading by means of Sol-fa (an invaluable chapter), Latin rhythm, Gregorian rhythm, style and interpretation, and finally two excellent chapters on "Congregational Singing of the Chant" and what he calls "Odds and Ends".

Truly it is difficult to find points for adverse criticism. Persons who are accustomed to sing the Chant from versions in modern notation will perhaps be surprised at what Dom David has to say in this connexion, but those of us who habitually use the traditional "square notation" will entirely agree with him. Some of us also might be inclined to say that a somewhat "tuneful" melody is more quickly learned by a congregation than one that is of itself the most simple. Dom David indirectly admits this in suggesting the use of Dom Gregory Murray's "People's Mass", which is more tuneful than simple, as a stepping-stone towards getting ordinary people to sing the Chant.

We do not hesitate to recommend this book, then, to all priests and choirmasters anxious to implement the Papal Instruction of September 1958 and the encyclical *Musicae Sacrae Disciplina*.

DOM ALDHELM DEAN

CORRESPONDENCE

"ATTITUDE AND GESTURE AT MASS"

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, January 1960, p. 33, March 1960, p. 192)

The Rev H. E. Winstone writes:

I must confess I find Fr Martin Rochford's letter quite exasperating. It does less than justice to Fr O'Connell's well-reasoned and instructive article, and in particular the use of the expression to "dragoon the congregation" is entirely misleading. Is the whole case for liturgical attitude and gesture, so well put by Fr O'Connell, to be demolished by a word? How can it be "dragooning the congregation" to teach them the significance and importance of liturgical gesture? Is this something that is just not worth teaching them? Surely, it would only be dragooning the congregation if we left them so ignorant of the value and significance of liturgical attitude that they themselves said *Cui bono* when asked to stand or to sit.

It is begging the question to say that Dialogue Mass is a "private Mass" and that therefore the congregation should kneel all the time except for the Gospel. The whole point of a Dialogue Mass is that it is a form of Mass in which the people *actively* participate by voice and gesture (*S.R.C. Instruction*, 22).

Finally, though I sympathize with Fr Rochford's "stoutly maintaining" that the congregation should always stand to sing the Gloria and Credo, it is amusing to find one who is so averse to dragooning the congregation denying them the one freedom of choice which the rubricians permit.

THE DEBATE ON FUTURE WAR

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1960, p. 77)

"Parochus Quidam" writes:

Most of us are interested in this question. Not being any kind of pacifist myself, I would not like to question Dr McReavy's assessment of the various contributions to the book *Morals and Missiles*. All the same I found myself critical of Dr McReavy on two points.

First, he wants us to base our conclusions on the numerous statements of Pope Pius XII. But Pope Pius XII is no longer with the Church Militant, and even during his life (as Dr McReavy indicates) his views were in process of development all the time. It seems to me highly arguable whether he ever "allowed" the use of nuclear weapons even in the most guarded way. But if he did, it seems fair to

suppose that by this time—like Montgomery, Eisenhower, and all realistic statesmen including Krushchev—he would have come round to the judgement that such use would be suicidal, and therefore presumably wrong.

Secondly, I feel critical of Dr McReavy's most lame and impotent conclusion: "to reserve one's final judgement of these possible issues until (which God forbid) they become actual, and meanwhile to do everything in our power to prevent their ever becoming actual". This, taken with the rest of his article, surely means that the next war is likely to end civilization, that it is still lawful, and that there is nothing to be done about it except prevent another war breaking out. This does not make sense, though it makes an excellent case for the pacifist. If there is one thing absolutely certain, it is that if we (or all Christians, or all sensible people) wait until war is on the point of breaking out, it will be too late to get any accurate information, or to make any "final judgements", or even to make our voice heard at all. To tell people to wait till the next war is imminent is surely to *abdicate*, as teachers of morality.

Dr McReavy replies:

I make no apology for expecting a collection of "Catholic" essays on the morality of nuclear war to take the doctrine of Pope Pius XII "as their principal guide". His is the most authoritative voice we have yet heard on the subject, and, when he spoke in 1956, he was already in possession of all the relevant facts. Were there to be a substantial change in the factual situation, his teaching might lose something of its practical value, but it loses nothing by his death; it was not Eugenio Pacelli, late of the Church Militant, who spoke, but the Vicar of Christ. Furthermore, I did not say that he "allowed" the use of nuclear weapons. Indeed, I was careful to say that to the best of my knowledge "he never positively approved of them"; but I regarded it as significant that he never condemned them outright.

The lameness and impotence of my conclusion is largely attributable to my inability to foresee with certainty how and for what precise cause the next war will be fought. A teacher of morality can here and now declare that certain things, such as the indiscriminate nuclear destruction of cities, will be immoral, but only a prophet can pass a definitive judgement in advance on the morality of the war itself.

The Rev. B. J. Wicker writes:

As one who had the privilege recently of discussing the morality

of war with Dom Bede Griffiths at Spode House, I would like to comment on Dr McReavy's article in your February number. He seems to assume that the Ideal of Non-Violence is an attitude of non-resistance. But, on the contrary, it is put forward in the conviction that it is the most (if not the only) effective form of resistance to aggression. It rests on the teaching of our Lord, which denies the "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" mentality—that is, the mentality which admits that only by repaying violent aggression with violent reprisals can resistance be offered. So far from being a practical evasion of the strictly moral question, it is an attempt to face it more squarely than has been usual in the past. Both the natural requirement to resist aggression and the supernatural requirement not to resist it by its own methods must be fully accepted and reconciled. Dr McReavy's statement that, if an injury must be resisted, it is no longer of counsel to turn the other cheek, assumes that to do so is a failure in resistance. The Stratmann-Griffiths thesis is the exact opposite of this. For them, the counsel is the supreme mode of resistance.

The thesis goes further than this, however: for it suggests that, in view of the achievements of Gandhi, a group which has not seriously tried this form of resistance cannot be said to have done everything possible to avoid war: and therefore it cannot undertake a just war, because it is one of the conditions of a just war that *every* alternative must have been tried and found wanting.

Dr McReavy seems to want to eliminate the interpretation of the natural law by private conscience from this discussion. But, with all respect, this is patently impossible. As a system of rules, the law is no doubt quite independent of private opinions. But rules are no guide to action unless they are applied to the concrete, particular situation in question. The judgement as to how, and whether, they apply to the situation cannot be made by anyone other than the person in that situation. The natural law, like every other law, lacks within itself any guidance as to how it is to be applied. Every moral action is, in this sense, unique and personal. Conscience may be not a "particularly reliable guide to objective truth": but, unfortunately, as Newman saw, "There is no ultimate test of truth beyond the testimony borne to the truth by the mind itself." The supremacy of the individual conscience here is inescapable, because it is part of the natural law itself. Its function is not to discern what the law is, but how it is to apply. The Pope's 1956 Christmas message does not contradict this. Saying "my conscience told me to refuse" is not to give a reason, certainly: it is to assert that my reason is a good one in this context. It is philosophically impossible to abrogate the work of the

sovereign conscience at the point where it has to be decided how the law applies in any situation.

Dr McReavy replies:

I can assure Fr Wicker that I do not want "to eliminate the interpretation of the natural law by private conscience". It would be a vain desire, for though some principles of the natural law apply unconditionally to every conceivable case, past, present and future, others, including the right to repel unjust force by force, are dependent in their application on the particular circumstances of the concrete situation. Nor do I deny that it is the moral duty of everyone, in every concrete situation, to obey the imperative dictates of his certain conscience, right or wrong. But it is also a moral duty to form one's conscience correctly in the light of the teaching of the Church, to which alone the authentic interpretation of the natural law has been divinely assigned. Now, according to the papal Christmas message of 1956, the situation can still arise in which a nation, threatened with nuclear attack, can be justified in going to war, and if, in that case, the legitimate Government takes the necessary defensive measures, "a Catholic citizen cannot invoke his own conscience in order to refuse to serve and fulfil the duties which the law imposes". One of the duties to which the Pope referred is clearly that of answering the call to arms. He would not have denied that, even in this case, the citizen must search his conscience and refuse to do anything which his Government has certainly no right to demand. He would not have denied that the citizen has a subjective duty to follow his own certain conscience even when it orders him to refuse what the Government is entitled to demand. What he clearly did deny is that the citizen has an objective right to disobey a legitimate order on the plea of conscience.

Fr Wicker's statement that "the natural law lacks within itself any guidance as to how it is to be applied", and that "every moral action is, in this sense, unique and personal" needs careful qualification. Taken literally, it smacks of the new existentialist ethic against which the late Pope more than once inveighed.¹ Returning to the subject, in an allocution of 2 November 1954, he reproved those who say: "Let the Church propose her doctrine and pass her laws as norms of our action. Nevertheless, when there is question of practical application to each individual's life, the Church must not interfere; she should let everyone of the faithful follow his own conscience and judgement. They declare that this is all the more

¹ Cf. Radio message, 23 March 1952 (*A.A.S.*, 1952, XLIV, p. 270); Allocution, 18 April 1952 (*THE CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1952, pp. 619 ff.)

necessary because the Church and her ministers are unaware of certain sets of circumstances, either personal, or extrinsic to individuals; in them each person has been placed and must take his own counsel and decide what he must do."¹ I do not say that this is Fr Wicker's attitude, but in view of the sense which has frequently been given to the argument he uses, it is necessary to emphasize that it is not a morally legitimate attitude.

Dom Bede Griffiths, O.S.B., writes:

In an article in the February number of *THE CLERGY REVIEW* Dr McReavy criticizes the book *Morals and Missiles* on the ground that the writers of the essays in it do not pay attention to the authoritative teaching of the Church on the subject. But I think that most of these writers, and many other Catholics, would say that their difficulty arises from the fact that the Church does not seem to have given any sufficiently clear directive on the subject.

Dr McReavy refers in particular to the teaching of the late Pope Pius XII. It is true that the Pope laid it down that resistance to unlawful aggression even by the methods of modern war might be lawful, but he did not say who was to decide whether the aggression was unjust or not, and it is here that the dilemma arises. Was the German aggression against Belgium in 1914 and against Poland in 1939 unjust or not? If it was unjust, why were German Catholics not informed of this and why did the German bishops give it their support? Why did the Pope himself make no pronouncement on it, but allow the Italian bishops to support Italy's alliance in the aggression? If it was not unjust, then how can the resistance of the British and their allies be justified?

Again in regard to methods of warfare, how is the ordinary man to know whether they are lawful or not? Dr McReavy admits that the indiscriminate bombing of enemy cities in the last war was unjust, but why was it that Catholics were given no guidance on this, and the Pope himself made no pronouncement even on the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

If a Catholic is thus left without guidance from the Pope or the bishops as to the lawfulness of a war or the methods used in it, how is he to decide what to do? It seems to me that he can only be left to the guidance of his conscience. If in his conscience he believes that the war is justified, he has the right to fight, but equally, if he believes that it is not justified, he has the right to be a conscientious objector. It is this right and duty of a Catholic to follow the dictates of

¹ A.A.S., 1954, XLVI, p. 673.

his conscience where the Church has given no clear direction, which seems to me to be of supreme importance.

Finally, may I say that in the matter of the natural law and the teaching of the Gospel, I admit that the natural law commands us to resist injustice and permits us to use force, even to the extent of killing a man in defence of justice, but I would not say that it obliges us to use violence. Was not the teaching of our Lord in the Gospel precisely that rather than resist violence by violence, we should try to overcome evil by good by the force of moral resistance? Mahatma Gandhi showed that such moral resistance, which refuses the use of any physical violence, is, in fact, capable of overcoming the strongest power. Is not this the ultimate message of the Gospel, that though it may be lawful to use violence under certain circumstances, the better way to which Christ calls His disciples, if they are willing to follow it, is to forego violence altogether and to use only that moral force which is prepared to suffer every injury and even death in order to overcome the evil? This was the method which our Lord Himself used and by which He overcame the powers of evil in this world.

Dr McReavy replies:

In the field of morals, the Church's *magisterium* is normally exercised only in regard to general principles, e.g. that "a modern war which is not demanded by the absolute necessity of self-defence against a very grave and otherwise unavoidable injustice is a crime" (Pius XII, October 1953). A decision on a particular case is seldom given unless the moral issue is expressly submitted to the judgement of the Church. Apart from such a decision, therefore, Dom Bede is right in saying that the individual Catholic is "left to the guidance of his own conscience" in applying the Church's teaching to a particular case. The point of my article was that he should seek to form his conscience according to the full teaching of the Church, not merely according to selected extracts. Part of the Church's teaching, as expounded by the late Pope, is that the situation can still arise in which a State is justified in calling its citizens to armed resistance. In such a situation, the citizen is still subjectively bound to follow his own certain conscience, but he has no objective right to refuse to take up arms on the ground that he prefers to follow the evangelical counsel, or that his conscience prescribes a merely moral resistance *à la* Gandhi.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

which
the
as to
kill-
es us
pre-
y to
atma
se of
ngest
gh it
etter
ollow
force
er to
nself
ld.

exer-
a war
fence
ime"
ldom
ment
ede is
nce of
par-
form
, not
hing,
ise in
ance.
ow his
use to
elical
nce d

hed for
W.I., in